

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`



AN v.S.4. 1828.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

WRITINGS

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

DR. JOHN LEONARD HUG,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURGH, IN BREISGAU, &c.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL GERMAN,

BY THE

REV. DANIEL GUILDFORD WAIT, LL.D.

RECTOR OF BLAGDON, SOMERSETSHIRE,

MEMBER OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

1827.

538.

1716, p. 429.), more boldly asserted. The original language, however, of this source, has been the point chiefly controverted.

Matt. xix. 16.	Luke xviii. 18.
xxvi. 14. 18. 69. 73.	xxii. 4. 10. 58. 59.
xxvii. 11. 20. 37.	xxiii. 2. 19. 38.

If a verbal harmony exists in the forty-two parallel sections of all three Gospels, between Matthew and Luke, the same will also constantly be found between Mark and Luke; *but in proportion as* Mark and Luke do not verbally harmonize with each other, so Matthew differs from Luke in expression. He then proves, in a series of arguments, that the verbal harmony will not shew Matthew to have made use of Luke.

The words are often so different in Matthew and Luke, in the relation of the same facts, that it cannot be assumed, that Matthew derived any thing from the Gospel of Luke.

Matt. xxi. 2. 7.	Mark xi. 2.	Luke xix. 30.

Respecting the question, whether Mark used the Gospel of Matthew? he inquires, if it were so, how could Mark have ventured to have placed the events in another chronological order, in a considerable part of his Gospel?

Mark i. vi. Matt. iii. xiii. and in several other instances *before cited.*

If Mark had used the Gospel of Matthew as a *source*, he would have followed the singular method of entirely omitting the greater part, of admitting one part, but of describing it much more circumstantially and expressly, and of transferring into his Gospel another part quite defectively and imperfectly. That which Mark has less than Matthew, may be seen from what has preceded; but his Gospel is by no means to be considered as an Epitome of Matthew, for he often details more copious accounts, as in v. 23—53.; ix. 14—49. Mark's omission of many circumstances necessary to the comprehension of the subject, evinces that he had no such a plan.

Mark iii. 34.	Matt. xii. 49.
vi. 10.	x. 11.
vii. 17.	xv. 15.
viii. 21.	xvi. 12.

been examined by Eichhorn with an indefatigable perseverance. The prevalent opinion has

In the sections common to all three Gospels, a verbal agreement subsists between Mark and Luke (Mark x. 15.; Luke xviii. 17., merely being excepted) only where the narratives in Mark and Luke are not amplified by additions.

In those sections, which merely Mark and Luke have in common, and which are no where found in the Gospel of Matthew (Mark i. 23—25.; Luke iv. 33—35. alone being excepted) no verbal harmony also is found.

If Mark had extracted materials from the Gospel of Luke, or even known it, the Prologue of the latter must have forced him to have remarked, that his own writing was not to be classed among those uncredited Diegeses of the Actions and Doctrinal Discourses of Jesus, which existed before the Gospel of Luke. For he narrates in his Gospel much that is absolutely wanting to Luke, and much in a different and even contradictory manner.

Mark i. 14—20.; iv. 30—34.; vi. 1—6. 45—56.; vii. 1—37.; viii. 1—26.

In Mark and Luke some accounts occur differing in facts, which occasionally amount even to contradictions.

Mark ii. 23—28.	Luke vi. 1—5.
iii. 20—35.	xi. 14—23.; xii. 10.
viii. 27.; ix. 1.	ix. 15—27.
ix. 30—38.	ix. 43—45.
x. 46—52.	xviii. 35—43.
xiv. 55—65.	xxii. 65—71.
xvi. 1.	xxiii. 56.; xxiv. 1.

That Mark should have been silent respecting that, which he had extracted from Luke, that he should have omitted essential parts of the historical narrations, is incredible, and affords a valid proof against the idea of his having used the Gospel of Luke, as a source.

Luke xxiv. 50.	Mark xiv. 47.
xxii. 8.	xiv. 13.
viii. 45.	v. 31.

If Mark had used the Gospel of Luke as a source, he would have afforded the singular example of, at one time, superfluously amplifying his source, and occasionally (Mark ii. 23—28.; Luke vi. 1—6) of

guage of Jesus and his Apostles was the Aramæan, and at the early period to which this

ferred into his own production all that the Gospel of Mark contained. But, that this is not the case is evident from

Mark i. 14—20. ; iv. 30—34. ; vi. 1—6. 45. ; vii. 31. 32—37. ; viii. 1—21. 22—26. ; x. 1—12. 35—45. ; xi. 11—14. 19—26. ; xii. 28—34. ; xiv. 3—9. 55—65. ; xv. 6—10. 17—20. ; which he has omitted.

Luke would in this case very often have permitted himself to differ from the accounts of Mark, and occasionally even directly to contradict them, which is inadmissible.

Luke iv. 42.	Mark i. 36.
vi. 16.	iii. 18.
viii. 31.	v. 10.
viii. 39.	v. 20.
viii. 42.	v. 23.
ix. 18.	viii. 27.
xviii. 35.	x. 46.
xx. 1—19.	xi. 27—xii. 12.
xxii. 58.	xiv. 69.
xxii. 61.	xiv. 30. 68. 72.
xxii. 67. 70, 71.	xiv. 60. 63.
xxiii. 35.	xv. 29.
xxiv. 4.	xvi. 5.

Luke would have made use of the Gospel of Mark with great carelessness, since he would have related whole histories much more out of order and more imperfectly (Luke viii. 41—56. ; Mark v. 22—45.) than Mark, and in many individual instances by the omission of illustrative circumstances (Luke vi. 1—5. ; Mark ii. 23—28. ; Luke viii. 22—25. ; Mark iv. 36—41.) and by the choice of indefinite expressions and inaccurate representations, he would have rendered the facts much more obscure, than they are in Mark.

Luke v. 17.	Mark ii. 1.
v. 27.	ii. 13.
vi. 10.	iii. 5.
viii. 8.	iv. 8.
viii. 22.	iv. 35.
viii. 33.	v. 13.
ix. 1.	vi. 7.
ix. 6.	vi. 13.

2. affords to us a proof, that it was an unusual thing for a Jew to write a book in Greek: and many critics have imagined, that the three Gospels internally betray evidences of not having been derived from a Greek source. This, however, is an inconclusive argument, because the native idiom of the writers would naturally have some effect on every language, in which they might write.

It has, notwithstanding, been contended, that the variation of expression in the detail of the same facts, in the same succession of ideas, and in the arrangement, but more particularly in the interchange of synonyms and phrases, both of which are frequently remarked in a collation of the parallel relations of the three Evangelists, is a phænomenon, which necessarily excludes the admission of a Greek source having been used by them. These (Bertholdt maintains) could not *have been* accidental.

It is, moreover,[z] urged, that there are vari-

[z] Among these, Matt. iii. 11.; Mark i. 7.; Luke iii. 16. are quoted, where the original term is presumed to have been לִמְשׁקֹל סִינִין, which Matthew correctly translated, but Mark and Luke understanding the root שקל to mean to loose, or take off, (Targ. Prov. xxv. 20.) interchanged the term with the phrase שׁרֵא שְׁנְצֵי סִינִין, (Deut. xxv. 9.; Jonath.)—Matt. iii. 16.; Mark i. 10.; Luke iii. 21.—The difference between the two former and Luke is explained by the hypothesis, that the Aramæan verb was עֲלָה, which was incorrectly written צְלָה in Luke's MS., or that Luke mistook the ע for the ץ.—Matt. iii. 16.; Mark i. 10.; Luke iii. 21.—here the original is conjectured to have been וּנְדָרַת רוּחָא דְקוּדְשָׁא כְּנוּפֵי יוֹנָא, where Luke inter-

by referring them to an original Aramaic text. But this postulate is no more necessary, than the preceding, and for a very similar reason, viz. that the *verbal* accounts, which the two latter might have received of these particulars, were most probably delivered in Aramæan, consequently the same result would follow, without the supposition of a written Gospel or Biography of our Saviour.

Various opinions have likewise been indulged, respecting the Greek Gospel of Matthew: some inclining to the idea that he himself may have translated it from his Aramaic copy, with certain alterations and additions, or that an unknown person may have done so after his death, —that, THAT in which Mark and Luke are more copious than him, may have been derived partly from other smaller, and partly from the same Diegeses,—also that THAT, which each of them has in common with the present Greek Gospel of Matthew, may have flowed from those individual Diegeses, which Matthew used in preparing the Greek edition of his

xxiv. 1.; Matt. xxviii. 1.; (Cf. John xx. 1.)—בשבתא was in the Aramæan *original*: and, it is well known, that נשף has reference both to נשף יממא and to נשף ליליא, *the morning and evening twilight* whence ὀψὲ originated.—Matt. xxvi. 17.; Mark xiv. 12.; Luke xxii. 7.: the words were in the Aramæan, ביומא קדמאה דפטירא, and יומא קדמאה *is either the first day* or *the principal day*, wherever a series of days is mentioned. Mark and the Translator of Matthew incorrectly adopted the first, and Luke the last sense. From *all of* which, it is evident that the common source was a work written in the Eastern Aramaic Dialect.—*(Bertholdt.)*

question, connected with these Theories, relates to the language, in which Matthew wrote the Gospel, which we now possess. *Several* of the Fathers assert it to have been composed in the vernacular language of Palestine, and not one of the *ancient* Fathers record the Greek to have been its original tongue. The objection to this argument, which those authors, who coincide with Hug, have made, viz. that one *blindly* followed the other, and that all may be retraced to Papias, who was, according to Eusebius, παντων σμικρος τον νουν, and a man who compiled oral traditions without examining their truth, is by no means conclusive; because it will be evident, that the tradition, which he preserved, was in favour of an Aramæan original, the truth of which it will now be impossible for any one to disprove. But, Eusebius also states[m], that Pantænus found the Aramæan Gospel of Matthew circulated in Arabia, about the middle of the second century. Papias, however, says nothing of its circulation in Arabia, consequently, these two accounts not having been possibly derived from one and the same source, the testimony of Pantænus is a full confirmation of the former witness. Eusebius likewise declares, that Matthew wrote his Gospel ἐν πατριῳ γλωττῃ, when he was about to quit Palestine,—*Origen*, that he wrote it for the Jews, who were *Believers*,—Hippolytus, that he edited it at *Jerusalem*, with whose statements

[m] Bertholdt. p. 1257—62.

Gematrical Speculations of the Cabbalists upon it would have been invincible barriers to the full progress of the Greek among the natives. But the concession of Matthew's Greek original to the Ἑβραιοι, will assume it to have been accounted by them equal to their native tongue.

Let us bring the case nearer to our own times and observations. England and Wales have been much longer united than Rome had then been with Judæa, on which connection Hug builds a considerable part of his argument; yet, in how many places in the latter is the English language totally unknown! The case was the same with Cornwall and the Highlands of Scotland: it is the same in Ireland and the Isle of Man. In how many parts of Switzerland and of Gascony is the French scarcely intelligible by a large proportion of the natives! in how many parts of Biscay is the Spanish a foreign tongue! Yet, a long connection has subsisted between these countries; whereas the Roman intercourse with Palestine had been comparatively short, and there, the prejudices being of a religious nature, were proportionably stronger: consequently, whether we look to past testimonies, or to evidences, the examination of which is in our power, both arguments and probability are directly opposed to the theory of Hug and of those who coincide with him.

We must, however, return to Bertholdt. Ac-

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM HOWLEY, D.D. F.R.A.S.

LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

My Lord,

Your Lordship's indefatigable zeal in promoting the interests of the Church, and in advancing the study of Biblical criticism and Theological Literature, distinguishes you, as the individual, to whom I may most appropriately dedicate this Translation of Hug's elaborate Introduction to the New Testament.

I feel also the greater confidence in availing myself of your Lordship's Permission, from the conviction, that the Book itself is not liable to that charge of Infidelity and Scepticism, which has been so deservedly alleged against several authors of the German School,—from the persuasion, that it is calculated to induce that sober spirit of critical inquiry, from which the

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

VERY different ideas of the origin, nature, and language of the New Testament have been entertained by different writers, who have investigated it, and in Germany in particular, they seem to have arranged themselves into two classes. Hug, whose work became first generally known by means of Cellerier's very imperfect epitome, may be considered as the principal and most learned writer of that class, which has opposed itself to the scepticism and fanciful theories of the other body of German divines; yet, he has largely availed himself of the researches of his predecessors, it may not be amiss to furnish those, who may hereafter be desirous of devoting their attention to the critical history of the New Testament, with a brief outline of Eichholdt's Introduction, in which the various opinions of all are comprised. In the course of this compendium, but few original observations will be made, and some things will necessarily be repeated, which will be found in the second volume of this work *.

* In this preface I have abstained from noticing the first volume,

Griesbach, Paulus, Plank, Eichhorn, Hartmann, Gratz, and Bertholdt have given synoptical tables of the parallel passages to be found in the Gospels of the three first Evangelists, which have been considered as the substance of the πρωτευαγγελιον [b]. Some have adduced

because the system of recensions, which is perhaps its most valuable part, forms the subject of Profr. Scholz's present labours, and because after the appearance of his Greek Testament and Prolegomena, I project a work, in which the subject will be fully treated. The first volume, however, is very defective in the history of some of the versions: the Armenian and Sclavonic are but imperfectly examined, the Malay and others of later date are entirely omitted, and an infinity of New Variorum readings might have been procured from hitherto uncollated Arabic and Anglo-Saxon MSS.

[b] Bertholdt has transcribed into his Introduction the following list from Eichhorn.

	MARK.	LUKE.	MATTHEW.
1.	i. 2—8.	iii. 1—13.	iii. 1—12.
2.	9—11.	21, 22.	13—17.
3.	12, 13.	iv. 1—13.	iv. 1—11.
4.	14.	14.	12, 13.
5.	29—34.	38—41.	viii. 14—17.
6.	40—45.	v. 12—16.	2—4.
7.	ii. 1—12.	17—26.	ix. 1—8.
8.	13—22.	27—39.	9—17.
9.	23—28.	vi. 1—5.	xii. 1—8.
10.	iii. 1—6.	6—11.	9—15.
11.	7—19.	12—19.	iv. 23—25.
12.	20—35.	xi. 14—23.; xii. 10.	xii. 20—50.
13.	31—35.	viii. 19—21.	46—50.
14.	iv. 1—34.	4—18.	xiii. 1—34.
15.	35—41.	22—25.	viii. 18—27.
16.	v. 1—20.	26—39.	28—34.
17.	22—43.	41—56.	ix. 18—26.
18.	vi. 7—13.	ix. 1—6.	x. 1—42.
19.	14—29.	7—9.	xiv. 1—12.
20.	30—44.	10—17.	13—21.

posing Mark and Luke to have collected the materials of their Gospels at Jerusalem, which existing in this oral Gospel could not but have had a striking resemblance to the narrative of Matthew. Thus, whilst he satisfies himself respecting the cause of their verbal coincidence, he argues, that they wrote their separate works, entirely independent of each other [c].

This hypothesis Bertholdt has refuted. Some of the Fathers were also of opinion, that the succeeding Evangelists harmonized their accounts, as much as possible, with those of the preceding. "Yet it is not enough to show, that Mark used Matthew or Luke, or that Luke used Matthew or Mark, or that Matthew used Mark or Luke, as a source: for in some Sections only two of the Evangelists agree, which Sections are wanting in the third." Therefore, though the latter may have availed themselves of the Documents of their Predecessors, they must also have had access to sources unappropriated by them. The question, however, whether the one made use of the other, has been so amply examined by almost every writer on the subject, and forms so considerable a proportion of Hug's researches, that we cannot enter into the *full* detail, without repeating arguments [d], which have been already produced.

[c] Eckermann's Erklärung aller dunklen Stellen des N. Test.

[d] We shall, therefore, merely epitomize Bertholdt. He argues, on the other side of the question, against the idea of Matthew having used Mark, from the more accurate representation of several Histories in the latter.

to have been the idea of Epiphanius, which John Clericus, in his Ecclesiastical History (Amst.

such direct contradictions between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, that even supposing Matthew to have been better informed, in many particulars, we can scarcely conceive him to have been the corrector and emendator, because he no where implies it in the remotest degree, and because he would thus have exemplified a moderation towards Luke, which could only be expected from a man of the highest cultivation and finest feelings, which, however, would have been utterly irreconcileable with his object of rejecting unauthentic relations.

Matt. v. 3.	Luke vi. 20.
viii. 28—34.	viii. 26—39.
ix. 16.	v. 36.
x. 32.	xii. 8.
xviii. 12.	xv. 4.
xx. 29—34.	xviii. 35, &c.
xxi. 1—11.	xix. 29—44.
xxi. 34. 36.	xx. 10, 11.
xxv. 15. 20. 22. 25.	xix. 13. 16. 18. 20.
xxvi. 57. 59.	xxii. 66.

Had Matthew consulted the Gospel of Luke, he must intentionally have suppressed many of his historical and chronological assertions.

Matt. iii. 17.	Luke iii. 23.
ix. 18.	viii. 41, 42.
xi. 2.	vii. 18.
xxvi. 17.	xxii. 8.
xxvii. 57.	xxiii. 50.
iii. 1.	iii. 1, 2.

Had Matthew made use of the Gospel of Luke, there could not have been much, which was more obscure and imperfect in his Gospel, than in the other.

Matt. vi. 26.	Luk xii. 24.
viii. 14—17.	iv. 38—44.
ix. 1—8.	v. 17—26.
ix. 9—17.	v. 27—29.
x. 34.	xii. 51.
xii. 1.	vi. 1.
xvii. 14.	ix. 37.

been examined by Eichhorn with an indefatigable perseverance. The prevalent opinion has

[illegible]

Mark i.—ii. 26.—54.; vi. 1—6. 45—52.; viii. 1—27.,

In Mark and Luke some accounts occur differing in [illegible] contain not even to contradictions.

Mark	Luke
[illegible]	vi. 1—5.
[illegible]	xi. 14—23.
viii. 27. ix. 1.	ix. 18—27.
ix. 30—38.	ix. 43—48.
x. 46—52.	xviii. 35—43.
xiv. 55—65.	xxii. 63—71.
xv. 1.	xxiii. 1.; xxiv. 1

That Mark should have been silent respecting that, which he had extracted from Luke, that he should have omitted [illegible] parts of the historical narrations, is incredible, and affords a valid proof against the idea of his having used the Gospel of Luke, as a source.

Luke	Mark
xxiv. 50.	xiv. 47.
xxii. 8.	xiv. 13.
viii. 45.	v. 31.

If Mark had used the Gospel of Luke as a source, he would have afforded the singular example of, at one time, superfluously simplifying his source, and occasionally (Mark ii. 23—28.; Luke vi. 1—6.; or

Jerome coincides. Now, if he wrote it for th Jewish-Christians (for these were also style Ἑβραιοι) as it can hardly be supposed, that *the* could read any Greek essay, even if the in habitants of the larger cities could in some de gree speak the language, it is most presumptive that he wrote it in the language, in which Jesus or his Apostles had been accustomed to address them. Had he composed it in any but the popular dialect, it is very unlikely, that it would have been favourably received, or have obtained any considerable circulation in Judæa: and if the Nazaræans and Ebionites read an Aramæan Gospel, even at the end of the fourth century, it is very inferible, that their Book was a mutilation of Matthew's Aramæan work. He could have had no immediate reason for preferring the Greek language, even if we assume him to have been conversant with it, because if he contemplated also the religious instruction of the Gentile Churches in Asia Minor, he must have been aware, that a sufficient number of Gentile Christians, who were acquainted with both tongues, were continually visiting Jerusalem, who would not have failed to have extended it among them by means of a Greek Translation. But, if he intended it for the Ἑβραιοι,—the inhabitants of Palestine, he must have had an immediate and most urgent reason for writing it in Aramæan.

Disputants of great name are indeed, to be

Hug has stated the different traditional accounts of the origin of his Gospel. It cannot merely have been dictated by Peter, nor have been compiled from reminiscences of his discourses, because excepting about twenty-four verses, it is analogous to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, partly in words, partly in matter, and most frequently also in arrangement. Hence it must have been derived from the same source as the other two Gospels, viz. that πρωτευαγγελιον, which Peter and the other Apostles possessed, as a doctrinal *Archetypus*. It would therefore naturally appear, that the Christians at Rome requesting Peter to communicate it to them by means of Mark, his Interpreter and Assistant, he delivered to him HIS Exemplar of the Aramæan πρωτευαγγελιον, that he might edite and translate it into Greek. Consequently, the original language of Mark's Gospel was Greek, as all antiquity avouches.

Hence we comprehend how some parts of the Evangelical History, which more immediately relate to Peter (*e. g.* the history of his denial) are more accurately and circumstantially detailed in Mark. We cannot assent to Schmidt, that this Gospel was not called Peter's Gospel until the end of the second century, for the purpose of obviating the objection of the Marcionites, that the members of the Orthodox Church read Gospels written by those who were not Apostles, because Papias' affirmation, that

were there erected tothe two Johns:—and, since Eusebius mentions from other authorities two Christian teachers of this name in Asia Minor in the first Century, there is no reason, why we should not credit the account. Probably, he did not attain the rank of πρεσβυτερος, until the death of the Evangelist: but if he had been invested with it before that event, John the Evangelist must have been the πρεσβυτερος of all the Christian Churches, in the south-western parts of Asia Minor, and his namesake have been merely the Presbyter of the Church in the city of Ephesus.

A great part of Bertholdt's learned and diffuse research into the history of James the elder, the younger, and the third, whom some have supposed to have been of that name, is recapitulated in this edition of Hug; but in that department of his inquiry, which refers to the brothers of Jesus, he notices, that Jesus had four brothers, who were called James, Jude, Joses, and Simon, of whom nothing more is known, excepting that they for a long time did not believe in Jesus, but afterwards became his disciples (Acts i. 14.)—that his mother's sister, Mary, had three sons, whose names were James, Jude, and Joses,—that the Apostle James the younger is the first of these,—that the second is the Apostle Jude, surnamed Thaddæus, and Lebbæus,—and that nothing further is known of Joses, the third. It is indeed singular, that two sisters should have

earliest of the Canonical Gospels, and Epiphanius refers it to the reign of Claudius, which is contradicted by his statement, that John was then more than ninety years of age. The subscriptions of several Greek MSS. mention A. 32. after Christ's ascension: the Memphitico-Coptic, Erpenius's Arabic version, and Nicephorus, A. 30. after that event. But this date is manifestly too early,—because he names Peter as the person who cut off the ear of Malchus, which the other three Evangelists have passed over in silence, and because he alludes to Peter's martyrdom, which renders it presumptive, that he wrote it immediately after Peter's death, consequently after A. 67, or 68. Yet neither are positively certain grounds of argument; for it is not conceivable, that by naming Peter as the individual, he could *at that time* have exposed him to danger. Others again have argued from v. 2., that it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, therefore before A. 70., against the absolute certainty of which John's well known inattention to Tenses forcibly militates.

We are, notwithstanding, guided more clearly to the solution of this question, by those parts, which John did not extract from the more ancient materials, but which he added in reference to his particular purposes. The Gnostical ideas had already obtained a considerable reception in Christianity, and had influenced John's Disciples. This leads us to the end o

had three sons of the same name; but were not particular names often transmitted, and, as it were, rendered hereditary in many families? This we must imagine to have been the case in the particular branches of David's family, which were then settled at Nazareth, to which Mary and her sister belonged, which admission will account for the same names occurring in the families of the two sisters. Yet this expedient of explaining the coincidence is somewhat suspicious. Hence, Eichhorn doubts the correctness of the names of the Brethren of Jesus, given in Matt. xiii. 53—58.; and Mark vi. 1—6., because these two sections of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark were not found in the *Protevangelium*, but were unauthenticated additions by another hand. Yet, though Bertholdt's opinion is similar, he does not conceive this sufficient to prove, that the Brothers of Jesus, who are mentioned in Matt. xii. 47.; Mark iii. 21. 31, 32.; John vii. 3. 5.; Acts i. 14., were not called James, Judas, Simon, and Joses. He accounts these names in the parallel sections (Matt. xiii. 53—58.; Mark vi. 1—6.) to be a very antient *interpolation*. For, if the Evangelist had chosen to record them, he would also have noticed the names of the Sisters of Jesus (for they must have been known to him) because they would have had as great a claim to be named as the Brothers. It is therefore very probable, that even those of the Brothers were not mentioned. Now a transcriber either of the Gospel of Matthew or Mark remem-

to John. Yet, because notwithstanding this, we read of actual brothers of Jesus after this event Acts i. 14., we are induced to adopt the opinion of those, who account the ἀδελφοὶ Ἰησοῦ mentioned here and there in the Gospels and Acts, as *half-brothers* from a former marriage of Joseph with another woman. And, as we frequently perceive jealousies arising between the children of two marriages, and a certain superiority affected by those of the first marriage, so the case seems to have been here; for, though, in the sequel, they might have been added to the number of our Saviour's disciples, yet his knowledge of their dispositions, and his past experience of them may have urged him to commend Mary to John in preference to them, for, after his own death, could he have well entrusted a stepmother to their care? Mary at this period was evidently a widow; for, throughout the history of our Saviour's riper years, we discover no vestige of Joseph being alive; and as Jesus was probably not an adult at the time of his death, it is inferible, that he was considerably older than his wife Mary, whence the conjecture of his previous marriage acquires stronger plausibility. Now, as it has almost amounted to a certainty, that those, whom we continually meet in the company of Mary, were *half-brothers* of Jesus, we must not seek for them in the younger James, Jude, Simon, and Joses; for their mother was

[1] Bertholdt, § 5. p. 2639—2665. § 623.

riages? The mother of James however might only have been a relation of Mary, and as such have been called her ἀδελφη. But even in this case, the younger James, Jude, and Simon could not have been begotten by Joseph in Levirate-nuptials, and have borne on that account, in the New Testament, the title ἀδελφοι Ἰησου. For, here we encounter again the same obstacle,—that these three persons had for a long period been found in the company of the true disciples of Jesus, during which those ἀδελφοι Ἰησου, who are here the subject of discussion, belonged, as it were, to his opponents. As we always find them also in domestic union with the mother of Jesus, it is still more improbable, that they were Joseph's Levirate-sons, for the Law was far from being so coercive, as to have required, that the children begotten by the Brother on the widow of the deceased should be reared and educated by him.

Now, as the Apostle Paul calls (Gal. i. 19.) the younger James ἀδελφος του Κυριου, we have no other resource but that of accepting ἀδελφος in the more extended sense of *relation* or *kinsman*. In this we are justified by the use of אח (Gen. xiii. 9.; xiv. 15.; xxix. 12. 15.) and by the occurrence of ἀδελφος in this acceptation, in profane Greek writers. Therefore, James, Jude, Simon and Joses are entirely distinct from the Brothers of Jesus, mentioned in Mark iii. 31, 32., and the parallel passages, as well as from the Brothers

additions. The preceding inquiry has determined him to have been a *kinsman* of our Saviour.

But, a question has arisen, whether Jude was a son of James? for, although the author of the Epistle calls himself ἀδελφος Ἰακωβου, which words are corroborated by all the ancient MSS. and versions, Grotius has conjectured, that they are not genuine, and that they were added by ancient transcribers under the idea, that Judas Thaddæus, otherwise called ὁ του Ἰακωβου, was the author of the Epistle. In Luke vi. 16., and Acts i. 13., he is entitled ὁ του Ἰακωβου, in which elliptical expression ἀδελφος may be supplied, as it often happens; but so also may υἱος, which is actually the case in the Syriac version, from which circumstance most of the later Syriac writers have asserted Judas Thaddæus to have been a son of James. It has more recently been remarked, in justification of the author of the Peshito, that analogy requires υἱος to be supplied in Luke vi. 16.; for, it must necessarily be wanting in τον του Αλφαιου, at verse 15. Had Luke intended ἀδελφον to have been inserted between Ἰουδαν Ἰακωβου, five words only intervening between these and Ἰακωβον τον του Αλφαιου, accuracy would have compelled him to have expressed it, as in the instance of Ἀνδρεας, at verse 14. The same is likewise inferible from Acts i. 13. where Ἰουδας Ἰακωβου stands in a still nearer connection with Ἰακωβος Αλφαιου;—the ellipsis indeed of ἀδελφος, υἱος, and πατηρ after the article connected with a proper name in the genitive,

percriticism to pronounce Clemens's account of Peter's visit to Rome, during the reign of Claudius, false likewise. It is evident that after his escape, he could no longer remain at Jerusalem; it is moreover expressly affirmed by Luke (Acts xii. 17.) that he repaired elsewhere. Having already travelled through Judæa preaching the Gospel, it is inferible that he then went to foreign countries: why then should we disbelieve the account, which avers that he also went to Rome? For we cannot but conclude from Paul's Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 17.) that very credible Men had long before preached Christianity in Rome; and the preceding History mentions to us Peter and Mark, as the individuals. If we admit the truth of the account, we observe the whole to be in its proper order: yet, we must not adhere to the chronology of Eusebius, which is well known to be often incorrect; for he places this first journey of Peter to Rome in A. D. 43: but as Peter did not leave Jerusalem before the death of the elder James, we must postpone it at least to A. D. 46. As he could, however, safely return to Jerusalem, after the death of Herod Agrippa, (Acts xii. 23.) we accordingly again perceive him present at the Apostolic Synod in that city, which is recorded in Acts xv. 7., &c.

Yet, as we observe him the next year at *Antioch*, he could not have long continued at *Jerusalem* (Gal. ii. 11., &c.) and the occurrence

selves with stating Bertholdt's idea, that it o
curred in the year 40. Ær. Dionys. He, ther
fore, dates Paul's first journey to Jerusalem aft
his conversion (Gal. i. 18.) early in the year 4
and the second early in the year 44 (Acts xi. 3(
four years after it.

But in Gal. ii. 1. it is said to have taken pla
not until *fourteen years* after his conversio
This must depend on the question, wheth
δια δεκατεσσαρων ἐτων or δια τεσσαρων ἐτων be the co
rect reading. (1.) Who can imagine the i
defatigable Paul to have remained inactive i
Tarsus, for the space of *ten years?* (Acts i
30.; xi. 25.) The conjecture, that during th
interval, he was prosecuting his trade, as
σκηνοποιος, is too improbable to be admitted, an
is contrary to the zeal, which he manifested
Damascus, only a few days after his conversio
(2.) It is equally incredible, that Barnabas, wh
became intimate with Paul, at his first journey
Jerusalem (Acts ix. 27.) should have thoug
no more of him FOR TEN YEARS, *and not unt
then* have brought him from Tarsus to Antioc
(Acts xi. 25.) (3.) The Church of Antioch w
established by some Christians, who had fle
from Jerusalem at the stoning of Stephen (Ac
viii. 2.; xi. 19, &c.) At first they baptized on
native Jews. Some of them, however, admitte
native Gentiles into their Communion, on whi
account Barnabas was sent to Antioch (Acts
22.) from whence he travelled to Tarsus, a

ıe majority of MSS. As Semler conjectures, a ranscriber may have considered the numerical ıign Δ (*quatuor*) to have been an abbreviation of δεκα, and written this word in full. This transcript was then copied by another person, who at the same time consulted another MS.: for, that many transcribers made use of several originals, formed the text from them collectively, and sometimes united two readings with each other, is a fact generally known to the critics of the New Testament. This second transcriber had, therefore, a MS. in which δια δεκα ἑτων was faultily written in full; but his other MS. had the original reading, δια δ' ἑτων. Arbitrarily combining both he therefore wrote δια ιδ' (δεκατεσσαρων) ἑτων.—Yet, the reading δεκατεσσαρων may have originated in 2 Cor. xii. 2., where Paul relates, that he had received an ἀποκαλυψις in an ἑκστασις, προ ἑτων δεκατεσσαρων, because he says in the Epistle to the Galatians, (ii. 1.) that his journey was undertaken in consequence of an ἀποκαλυψις. The Transcriber of the Epistle to the Galatians may have had an obscure and incorrect recollection of this passage: —for, his memory may have changed προ δεκατεσσαρων ἑτων into δια δεκατεσσαρων ἑτων. Thus supposing Paul in both places to have spoken of one and the same ἀποκαλυψις, without giving himself any further trouble, he may have altered τεσσαρων into δε τεσσαρων.—Now, if we are authorized in assuming that in the ancient lines (Gal. ii. 1.) the *varia lectionis* δια δεκατεσσαρων ἑτων and δια τεσσαρων existed, it may be easily explained, how

Archipelago. The time of his leaving Ephesus, in consequence of the commotion excited by Demetrius, may be fixed before Easter in the year 58. (1 Cor. xvi. 8. cf. v. 7, 8.)

He now executed his intention of visiting Macedonia, which he accomplished by way of Troas; from Macedonia he went westwards to Hellas, and abode three months at Corinth. His object being to carry to Jerusalem the collections made for the poor Christians there, he was obliged, on account of the snares laid for him by the Jews, to go by way of Macedonia. After a tedious voyage from Neapolis and Assos, he arrived at Jerusalem, a short time after the Pentecost, in the year 58, (Acts xx. 3.—xxi. 15.) Here, he was soon apprehended, and taken as a prisoner to Cæsarea, in which city he remained a captive for two years; but on his appeal to the Imperial Tribunal, as a Roman Citizen, he was sent to Rome. This journey appears to have been commenced in the month of October, A. 60, and to have been ended in the spring of A. 61. Before his enlargement he was detained two full years διετιαν ὁλην—(xxviii. 31.) in Rome.

The remaining part of his history is not so well avouched. Probably, after his liberation, he continued for a little time in some other part of Italy, until he found an opportunity of betaking himself to another country. In the

all the Semitic dialects, and in the Chaldee Aphel (אמר Heb. המר) may signify, according to the Arabic, *abire facere*. Consequently, the Apostle was speaking of the exposure and abandonment of children, which were by no means unusual among the Pagans; and whilst he dissuades his readers from this inhuman practice, he exhorts them rather to educate them in the Christian doctrines.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, although its most general superscription is, ἡ προς Ἑβραιους ἐπιστολη, is quoted in the Roman Catalogues from the end of the second century, under the name Epistola ad Alexandrinos, probably from the notion, that it was directed to the Jewish Christians at Alexandria. Storr imagined it to have been intended for the Jewish Christians in Galatia, and to have been dispatched by Paul at the same time, as the Epistle to the Galatians, which was designed for the Gentile Christians there. Several formerly supposed Asia Minor to have been its destination, and Semler and Noesselt determined its object to have been the Jewish Christians and the Christians from Gentile Proselytes (σεβομενοι τον Θεον, whom Eusebius. Hist. Eccl. iii. 4. comprises under the Ἑβραιοι) in Macedonia, more particularly in its principal city Thessalonica, in which was the mother Church. Others, among whom are Heinrichs and Ludwig, conjectured those to whom it was sent, to have been the Jews in Spain, and Wetstein

supposes them to have been the Jews in Rome. Bolten more probably imagined it to have been directed to those Jewish Christians of Palestine, who were compelled, sometime after the year 60, by the oppressions of the Jews to abandon Jerusalem and Palestine altogether, and to seek safety elsewhere, (more particularly in Asia Minor,) from their persecutions, whence they are styled c. vi. 18. καταφυγοντες, and xiii. 14., (*Cf.* xi. 13–16.) people, who had no enduring residence in any city. Weber supposes Paul to have written it to the Jewish Christians in Corinth, and conceives it to have been the fourth of the five Epistles, which the Apostle is said to have written to the Corinthian Church. This he supports by a copious and curious collation of passages in the two Epistles, which we have *not* space to insert. But the most ancient and general opinion was, that it was *designed* for the Christians in Judæa; and so must *he* have *thought*, who gave to it the superscription προς Εβραιους, for that this was the meaning of Εβραιοι in the first and second centuries, is proved by Acts vi. 1., where the Ελληνισται are the Jewish Christians from foreign countries and the Εβραιοι the native Jewish Christians. This hypothesis Bertholdt opposes at great length, and proceeds to state his own conviction, that it was written to the Jewish Christians resident in Babylon, to whom also Peter sent his Epistle, because a Church appears to have been established there, and they might be expected to have had a

have been written much before the end of th year 61:—it might, indeed, not have bee written before the year 62.

Bolten, again, assumes this Epistle to have had an Aramæan original, which he attempts particularly to establish by two passages, in which he fancies the detection of errors in the translation. In c. v. 25—27. Paul writes, that Christ loved the Church, and offered himself up for it, ἱνα αὐτην ἁγιασῃ, καθαρισας τῳ λουτρῳ τοῦ ὑδατος, ἐν ῥηματι, ἱνα παραστηση αὐτην ἑαυτῳ ἐνδοξον, την ἐκκλησιαν μη ἐχοντα σπιλον ἡ ῥυτιδα, ἡ τι τῶν τοιουτῶν, ἀλλ' ἱνα ᾖ ἁγια και ἀμωμος. The leading idea in these words is that of purification, to which ἐνδοξος and the mention of Baptism are conformable, but ῥυτις denotes a bodily defect, or at least a consequence of age, which it is in no one's power to avert. Paul, however, wrote קמט which signifies not only *wrinkle*, but *blemish (macula)*:—HE *intended* its second sense, but his Translator *adopted its first.* Ἐν ῥηματι may also be considered as an error, which was either written על דברת די (Dan. ii. 30.) or בפתגמא די *on this account, for this purpose* (Onk. Ex. xviii. 11. Hebraice כדבר אשר—LXX. ἑνεκεν τουτου, ὁτι)—but the Translator literally rendered it ἐν ῥηματι, ἱνα. The second passage to which Bolten refers, is in c. vi. 4. οἱ πατερες, μη παροργιζετε τα τεκνα ὑμῶν· ἀλλ' ἐκτρεφετε αὐτα ἐν παιδειᾳ και νουθεσιᾳ Κυριου. Here no antithesis appears between μη παροργιζετε, and ἀλλ' ἐκτρεφετε:—Paul but made use of מרר which exists in

supposes them to have been the Jews in Rome. Bolten more probably imagined it to have been directed to those Jewish Christians of Palestine, who were compelled, sometime after the year 60, by the oppressions of the Jews to abandon Jerusalem and Palestine altogether, and to seek safety elsewhere, (more particularly in Asia Minor,) from their persecutions, whence they are styled c. vi. 18. καταφυγοντες, and xiii. 14., (Cf. xi. 13—16.) people, who had no enduring residence in any city. Weber supposes Paul to have written it to the Jewish Christians in Corinth, and conceives it to have been the fourth of the five Epistles, which the Apostle is said to have written to the Corinthian Church. This he supports by a copious and curious collation of passages in the two Epistles, which we have not space to insert. But the most ancient and general opinion was, that it was *designed* for the Christians in Judæa; and so must *he* have *thought*, who gave to it the superscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους, *for that* this was the meaning of Ἑβραῖοι in the first and second centuries, is proved by Acts vi. 1., where the Ἑλληνισταὶ are the Jewish Christians from foreign countries and the Ἑβραῖοι the native Jewish Christians. This hypothesis Bertholdt opposes at great length, and proceeds to state his own conviction, that it was written to the Jewish Christians resident in Babylon, to whom also Peter sent his Epistle, because a Church appears to have been established there, and they might be expected to have had a

have been written much before the end of the year 61:—it might, indeed, not have been written before the year 62.

Bolten, again, assumes this Epistle to have had an Aramæan original, which he attempts particularly to establish by two passages, in which he fancies the detection of errors in the translation. In c. v. 25—27. Paul writes, that Christ loved the Church, and offered himself up for it, ἱνα αὐτην ἁγιαση, καθαρισας τῳ λουτρῳ του ὑδατος, ἐν ῥηματι, ἱνα παραστηση αὐτην ἑαυτῳ ἐνδοξον, την ἐκκλησιαν μη ἐχοντα σπιλον ἠ ῥυτιδα, ἠ τι τῶν τοιουτῶν, ἀλλ' ἱνα ἡ ἁγια και ἀμωμος. The leading idea in these words is that of purification, to which ἐνδοξος and the mention of Baptism are conformable, but ῥυτις denotes a bodily defect, or at least a consequence of age, which it is in no one's power to avert. Paul, however, wrote קמט which signifies not only *wrinkle*, but *blemish* (*macula*):—HE *intended* its second sense, but his Translator adopted its first. Ἐν ῥηματι may also be considered, as an error, which was either written על דברת די (Dan. ii. 30.) or בפתנמא די *on this account, for this purpose* (Onk. Ex. xviii. 11. Hebraice בדבר אשר—lxx. ἐνεκεν τουτου, ὁτι)—but the Translator literally rendered it ἐν ῥηματι, ἱνα. The second passage to which Bolten refers, is in c. vi. 4. οἱ πατερες, μη παροργιζετε τα τεκνα ὑμῶν· ἀλλ' ἐκτρεφετε αὐτα ἐν παιδειᾳ και νουθεσιᾳ Κυριου. Here no antithesis appears between μη παροργιζετε, and ἀλλ' ἐκτρεφετε:—Paul but made use of מרר, which exists in

any of the tribes of Israel; not any individual Community to the exclusion of others in the Dispersion. Asia Minor naturally suggests itself to us as the *particular* scene of some of its allusions, because many parts of Paul's Epistles to these Churches, and the seven Apocalyptical correspond to them. But, independently of these individual references, it was a circular of general extent.

It has already been shewn, that we must impute it to James ὁ ἀδελφος του Κυριου. Bertholdt supposes it to have been written in Jerusalem, between the years 57 and 62, and differs from Hug, as to its object and occasion. Faber, Bolten, and Schmidt imagine James to have written it in Aramæan, and the two latter conjecture, that some Christian resident at Jerusalem, who was thoroughly versed in Greek, translated it into that language, at his desire; as, from the *number of* persons so qualified, visiting and leaving *Jerusalem continually*, he never could have been in want of a Translator. To this Bertholdt thinks, that some although not validly may object the existence of "*two Hexameters*" in

i. 17. πασα δοσις αγαθη, και παν δωρημα τελειον,
iv. 4. μοιχοι και μοιχαλιδες, ουκ οιδατε, ὁτι Φιλια,

but, even if these were *correct* verses, they would prove nothing but a poetical excursion of the Translator, or they might be merely accidental. Bolten is undecided, whether two errors

any of the tribes of Israel; not any individual Community to the exclusion of others in the Dispersion. Asia Minor naturally suggests itself to us as the *particular* scene of some of its allusions, because many parts of Paul's Epistles to these Churches, and the seven Apocalyptical correspond to them. But, independently of these individual references, it was a circular of general extent.

It has already been shewn, that we must impute it to James ὁ ἀδελφος τοῦ Κυριοῦ. Bertholdt supposes it to have been written in Jerusalem, between the years 57 and 62. and differs from Hug, as to its object and occasion. Faber, Bolten, and Schmidt imagine James to have written it in Aramæan, and the two latter conjecture, that some Christian resident at Jerusalem, who was thoroughly versed in Greek, translated it into that language, at his desire; as, from the *number of* persons so qualified, visiting and leaving *Jerusalem continually*, he never could have been in want of a Translator. To this Bertholdt thinks, that some although not validly may object the existence of "*two Hexameters*" in

i. 17. πᾶσα δοσις ἀγαθη, και πᾶν δωρημα τελειον,
iv. 4. μοιχοι και μοιχαλιδες, οὐκ οἰδατε, ὁτι Φιλια,

but, even *if* these were *correct* verses, they would prove nothing but a poetical excursion of the Translator, or they might be merely accidental. Bolten is undecided, whether two errors

of translation may not be discerned in the Epistle. The first is in ἰος c. v. 3. of which the original was possibly שחתא, which signifies *corruption and loss* as well as *rust:* James may have intended the former sense, but the Translator adopting the latter may have written ἰος:—in which case κατιωται likewise must have been expressed by שחת. The other is in chap. v. 20. where καλυπτειν is presumed to have been a version of עמה, which means to *cover* and to *hide* or *conceal,* in which James intended the first, but the Translator adopted the second. This, however, is incorrect, because καλυπτειν ἁμαρτιας occurs in 1 Pet. iv. 8., and is borrowed from Prov. x. 12., Ps. xxxii. 1. Bertholdt therefore proceeds to detect a stronger proof in chap. iii. 6., in which τροχος τῆς γενεσεως was most probably גלגלת ילדות—*caput nativitatis,* גלגלת being used per synecdochen for *homo, persona,* consequently, it will mean *homo nativus, man as he is born,* which the Translator, accepting גלגלת in the sense of גלגל *a wheel,* rendered τροχος τῆς γενεσεως. This interpretation also harmonizes with the preceding ὁλον το σωμα.

Faber derives his proofs in a different manner from the Paronomasia and allusions still in the Syriac text, which are wanting in the Greek, from whence he infers the Syriac to have derived them from the original Aramæan, and the Greek Translator to have been unable to express them in his version. Λειπομενοι (i. 4.) and ὀνειδιζοντος (5.)

are a play on words in the Aramaic, e.g. כחסר חסדין, so are ἀνεμιζομενος (6.) and ὁδος (8.) דשכשא לחן רחמא אורחא, — παρελευσεται (10.) and ἀπωλετο (11.) עבר, אבד, ποιητης (23, 25.) and ἀπεληλυθε (24.) עבר, עבד. We can only fully explain, why the νομος τῆς ἐλευθεριας (25.) is called τελειος by the Aramæan expression משלמנא: for it was so called, because, (as he says in c. ii. 8.,) it must be fulfilled or observed (שְׁלֵם). An Aramæan text will illustrate the reason of his simply selecting the example of Abraham and Rahab in chap. ii. among the many, which he might have produced from the Old Testament, because in the 13th verse he is speaking, according to the Greek, of ἐλεος, which, in Aramaic is רחמא. The sound of this word then led him to the two examples (23. 25.) for as Abraham's epithet, φιλος τοῦ Θεοῦ, gave rise to the new Paronomasia רחמא דאלהא, and thus recalled him also to his mind. In chap. v. 11. we read in the Greek text, μακαριζομεν τοὺς ὑπομενοντας, but why is Job alone cited?—because μακαριζομεν is in Syriac יהבינן טובא and יהבינן suggested to him איוב. In chap. v. 16., we read, πολυ ἰσχυει δεησις δικαιου ἐνεργουμενη, and the Prophet Elijah alone is quoted, as an example: for it is in Syriac רב זו חילה דצלותא, where חילה called אליא to his mind. In ch. iii. 6. we are not struck with σπιλουσα, which is מבתם (*maculans*), yet was it selected, because it is paronomastic with מוקדא (ἀναπτει. 5.) and מיקד (φλογιζουσα, φλογιζομενη. 6.) These examples will suffice to shew the puerilities and wild reveries of this Critic of the New

Testament, many of which are liable to serious charges of incorrectness, and most, if not all, to the imputation of absurdity [c].

The first Epistle of Peter comes the next under discussion. This also is a circular or encyclic Epistle, directed to the Jewish Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Proconsular Asia and Bithynia; but, it is urged, that Peter forgot that he was writing to these, in that part (c. iv. 1—4.) where he also exhorted the Gentile Christians. Bertholdt accounts for it from the admixture of both classes of Christians in Asia Minor, and Peter's supposition, that his Epistle might also be read by them. This may partly be the case: yet, when we consider the loose state of morals among the Jews of that age, and their subversion of the legal requisitions of morality by their traditions, it will appear far from conclusive, that he was guilty of this forgetfulness. As he includes his countrymen (ἡμῖν) in his censure; (for he contrasts them with τα ἐθνη, to whose practices they had conformed themselves,) and as by εἰδωλολατρειαι he simply means *heinous wickedness* (Col. iii. 5.) in which acceptation the Jews also used the term, as Schoettgen, (Hor. Hebr. et Talm. T. i. p. 779.) and Wetstein (N. T. ii. p. 254.) have fully established, no authority remains for this supposition of Bertholdt and Sommelius.

[c] The title of his strange work is, Observationes in Epistolam Jacobi ex Syro, à J. M. Faber. Coburgi, 1770. 4to.

This Epistle was excluded from the Canon by the Paulitians, by Theodore of Mopsvhest, and the author of the Roman Catalogue, whom some have supposed to have been Caius the Presbyter, but not in consequence of any suspicion of' spuriousness. Yet, from the second century downwards, in most countries, where Christianity prevailed, it was reckoned among the βιβλοι ενδιαθηκοι, and accounted an authentic production of Peter. So it was considered through all succeeding centuries, until Cludius first disputed its authenticity, and Eichhorn, with some modifications, followed his example. The latter conceiving a Disciple of Paul, probably Mark the Evangelist, to have been employed at it, at Peter's instigation, seeks to prove his hypothesis by the following parallel:

Eph. i. 3. (ii. Cor. i. 3.)	1 Pet. i. 3.
Εὐλογητος ὁ Θεος και πατηρ τοῦ Κυριοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.	Εὐλογητος ὁ Θεος και πατηρ τοῦ Κυριοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Eph. v. 22 [a].	1 Pet. iii. 1.
Αἱ γυναικες τοῖς ἰδιοις ἀνδρασιν ὑποτασσεσθε.	Αἱ γυναικες ὑποτασσομεναι τοῖς ἰδιοις ἀνδρασι.
1 Thess. v. 6.	1 Pet. v. 8.
γρηγορῶμεν και νηφωμεν.	νηψατε, γρηγορησατε.
1 Cor. xvi. 20.	1 Pet. v. 14.
Ἀσπασασθε ἀλληλους ἐν φιληματι ἁγιῳ.	ἀσπασασθε ἀλληλους ἐν φιληματι ἀγαπης.
Rom. xiii. 1. 3. 4 [b].	1 Pet. ii. 13, 14.
πᾶσα ψυχη ἐξουσιαις ὑπερεχουσαις ὑποτασσεσθω· οὐ γαρ ἐστιν ἐξουσια, εἰ μη ἀπο Θεοῦ το ἀγαθον ποιει, και ἐξεις	ὑποταγητε παση ἀνθρωπινῃ κτισει δια τον Κυριον, εἰτε βασιλεῖ, ὡς ὑπερεχοντι, εἰτε ἡγεμοσι.. πεμπομενοις εἰς ἐκδικη-

[a] Hug selects Col. iii. 18.

[b] Hug here selects 1 Tim. ii. 1., &c.

ἐπαινον ἐξ αὐτης.....διακονος ἐστιν ἐκδικος εἰς ὀργην τῷ το κακον πρασσοντι.	σιν μεν κακοποιων, ἐπαινον δε ἀγαθοποιων.

From these and other examples, Eichhorn argues not the direct use of Paul's Epistles, but reminiscences of his oral discourses, which presuppose a person to have been the author, who had been long in his company, &c. &c.;—it is, on the other hand, clear, from Peter's acquaintance with Paul's writings, which he himself attests, that the coincidence may have arisen from his perusal of them, and that he notwithstanding, may have been the author of the Epistle. That it is to be attributed to him alone has been too amply proved by preceding writers to render any recital of their arguments or of Bertholdt's inquiry expedient.

From the mention of Babylon in the salutation (v. 13.) it would seem, that there could be no doubt, as to the place, whence the Epistle was sent: but it has been disputed, whether συνεκλεκτη refers to the Church or to his wife. That he was married, and that his wife accompanied him in his travels, we are certified by Matt. viii. 24.; 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5. But the Peshito is a positive argument against this latter notion: e. g. ܕܒܒܠ ܒܥܕܬܐ ܕܒܝܬ *Ecclesia* electa, quæ est in Babylone: for the Translator of this early version must have known, what the Greek Christians understood by συνεκλεκτη. The Epistle was, therefore, written in Babylon, and we have no

gone abroad among Christians, from the ancient Hebrew prophecies against this city, that it was utterly destroyed, and rendered uninhabitable. Yet, its calamitous fate did not reach this pitch: —it was, according to Strabo, partly desolated, although it still continued to be habitable, and Josephus informs us, that a great number of Jews were settled there. Hence, Cosmas Indicopleustes, the Teachers of the Westaramæan Christians, Erasmus, Drusius, Jacob Castell, Lightfoot, Bengel, Wetstein, Basnage, Beausobre, and many more determined this to have been the place. But we hear nothing of Peter for nearly thirteen years before his death: it is therefore probable, that he was in some remote Country; and none is more probable than this place, where a considerable Dispersion was established, and a Church was founded, or may have been founded by him.

Hence the opinion of those, who, conceiving Babylon to imply Rome, date the Epistle in the year 66, falls to the ground; and Bertholdt, after a carefully conducted chronological examination, decides, that it could not have been written before the year 58, nor after the year 61.

It has been alleged, that Peter, who before his vocation to the Apostolic Office, followed the employment of a fisherman, and was ἀνθρωπος ἀγραμματος και ἰδιωτης (Acts iv. 13.) could have hardly written Greek, because it was only known to the

better educated among the Jews, or to those who prosecuted a foreign trade, and that even after his intercourse with the Greeks in later times, he seems to have been unable to speak the language with fluency, and to have required an interpreter. Jerome and Baronius perceived this from his Epistles, which they suppose to have been written in Hebrew (or Aramaic) the latter more definitively naming Mark, as his interpreter, consonantly to the voice of antiquity. Bolten, however, has observed, that the Epistles exhibit no similarity to Mark's style, and appear to be rigid translations of an Aramæan original. Among the errors which he fancies himself to have detected, is chap. v. 5., νεωτεροι ὑποταγητε πρεσβυτεροις, where the latter is an official name and does not mean *old people*, as Hensler avers. It is connected with the preceding v. 1—4., in which πρεσβυτεροι (in union with whom Peter is a συμπρεσβυτερος) who are also called ἐπισκοπουντες, are, decidedly, the overseers or superintendents of the Churches. But how then can νεωτεροι form an antithesis to πρεσβυτεροι? A person, who carelessly copied Greek, could not have made this antithesis, but a translator from the Aramaic might. Peter placed the Aramæan word עלמי (which is here used in the Peshito) *vulgares, people from the common mass,* who were afterwards styled Λαϊκοι; but, as they did not then write with vowel-points, his Translator accepted it as עלמי *pueri*, whence came νεωτεροι. To this Bertholdt adds, chap. ii. 13., in which κτισις is used

The only one of these, which is fully parallelized, is 2 Pet. iii. 1—3., and Jude 17, 18.: the others, however, shew a decided agreement of subject and matter. But in the second chapter, the coincidence is more certain, as Hug has proved: —which coincidence has induced a discussion, whether any previous understanding existed between Peter and Jude, whether they both extracted their matter from a common source, whether the one was borrowed from the other, or whether the second chapter of Peter was a subsequent interpolation.

Peter could not have been in Babylon when he wrote this Epistle, because he has inserted no salutation from the Church, which was established there: he probably was in Rome, because (i. 13, 14.) he speaks of a presentiment which he had of his death. Hence, its date must be referred to the year 66, or to the beginning of 67. It seems to be a translation from an Aramæan original, because vestiges of this language are discernible in it, in greater numbers, than in the first; but the difference of style proves, that neither Silvanus nor Mark (as we are certified by a comparison of it with his Gospel,) could have been the Translator. Perhaps therefore (as Bolten suggests) Glaucias, whom the Fathers likewise mention as one of Peter's interpreters, may have been the Individual.

The Epistle of Jude is also a circular. Its

Berger and Augusti[1] indulged very similar notions of it. Bertholdt, however, contends, that it cannot be proved to have been dispatched at the same time as the Gospel, and that the Epistle itself affords evidence of the lapse of some intermediate time. For, in c. iii. 7. we read, οὐκ ἐντολην καινην γραφω ὑμῖν; whence it follows, that the readers had already one of John's works in their possession, and from c. i. 1—3. it follows, that this could be no other than the Gospel. He urges likewise, that in c. ii. 12, 13. γραφω refers to this Epistle, and (at vers. 14.) ἐγραψα to the Gospel.

The voice of Antiquity has ever considered this Epistle to have been the genuine production of St. John, and we may be fully convinced of its correctness. Yet, Lange and Cludius, indulging in the outrageous reveries of a certain class of German divines, have openly disputed this testimony: but who can read it without perceiving the same tone of feelings and ideas as prevail in the Gospel, without being obliged to infer from its genius and phraseology, that both proceeded from the same writer? For both have the same characteristic peculiarities of expression, the same Grammatical irregularities, the same use of phrases and emphases, *e. g.*

[1] Augusti's Übersetzung und Erklärung der Katholischen Briefe. Thl. 2. S. 187.

Cf. Evan. iii. 21.	Ep. i. 6.
viii. 44.	i. 8. ii. 4.
xviii. 37.	ii. 21.
viii. 44.	iii. 8.
vii. 17.; viii. 47.	iii. 10.; iv. 1.
viii. 23.	iv. 5.
xiv. 20.	iv. 13.
viii. 12.; xii. 35.	i. 6.; ii. 11.
xvi. 3.; xvii. 25.	ii. 3, 4. 13, 14.; iv. 6, 7, 8.; v. 20.
xv. 13.; x. 11. 13. 17, 18.	iii. 16.
i. 29. 36.	iii. 5.

Both also use certain words in a peculiar sense: *e. g.*

Cf. Evan. v. 44.; viii. 43.; xiv. 17.	Ep. iii. 9.; iv. 20.
ii. 23.; v. 12. (ἰχεῖν.)	ii. 23.; iv. 18.

Both are replete with affirmative and negative clauses in a sentence: *e. g.*

Cf. Evan. i. 20.	Ep. i. 6.
i. 3.; iii. 15. 17, 18.	i. 5. 8.; ii. 4. 10. 27, 28.

or with antitheses or parallels: *e. g.*

Cf. Evan. i. 8. 17, 18. 26. 30.; ii. 10. 19. 23. 25.	Ep. ii. 2. 4. 6—8. 10. 12. 14. 16, 17. 19. 21. 23.

or with definitions: *e. g.*

Cf. Ev. i. 19.; iii. 19.; vi. 29. 39. 40. 58.; ix
30.; xv. 8. 10.; xvii. 3.
Ep. i. 5.; iii. 11.; ii. 3. 7. 22. 25.; iii. 10, 11
16. 19. 23, 24.; iv. 3. 9, 10. 13. 17.; v
2. 5. 11. 14.

or with the author's elucidation and improve
ment of his expressions: *e. g.*

Cf. Ev. i. 7, 8.; iv. 1, 2.; vi. 45, 46. 58.; vii. 22.
xiii. 10. 18.; xiv. 22. 27.; xv. 15.; xvi
9. 19.
Ep. ii. 2. 21.; iv. 10. v. 6. 16.

But the most remarkable proof is, that th
same Grammatical irregularities occur in both
that all the Greek tenses are used in both a
Aorists: Ep. i 3. ἀπαγγελλομεν for ἀπηγγειλαμεν—
Ep. i. 8. 10. ἐχομεν ἁμαρτιαν for ἡμαρτηκαμεν; tha
the *verba finita* are periphrased by εἰναι and th
participle.

Cf. Ev. i. 34.; iii. 21. 23, 24. 27. 28. Ep. i. 4.; iv. 12.

that many particles are irregularly used, as ἐι
for ἐαν Ep. iv. 17., and that in both the sam
incorrect modes of uniting words are found
e. g.

Cf. Ev. xvii. 2.; vi. 37. 39.; vii. 49. Ep. ii. 8. 25.; v. 1

pose a previous personal acquaintance. But, as Flatt remarks, does he not write in the same manner to the Colossians and Laodiceans, whom also he did not personally know? and might he not have formed an acquaintance with those, whom he greets in the 16th chapter, during his travels? This was indeed the fact; for he first knew Aquila and Priscilla (xvi. 3.) at Corinth and Ephesus (Acts xviii. 2. 19—26.; 1 Cor. xvi. 19.) and Epenetus (xvi. 5.) he mentions as the first fruits of Christianity *in Asia;* doubtless he formed his knowledge of him at Perga in Pamphylia, or at Antioch in Pisidia, in both of which cities he made his earliest Proselytes (Acts xiii. 13, &c.) He mentions Andronicus, Junias, and Herodion as his kinsmen, (xvi. 7. 11.) and he might have known them from his youth. If Rufus (xvi. 13.) was the son of Simon of Cyrene (Mark xv. 21.) he was educated in Jerusalem, and Paul, for a very long period, must have been intimate with him and his mother. Since Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermias, Patrobas, and Hermes (xvi. 14.) were greeted with the Brethren, who were with them (συν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφοι) there is no doubt that they were Christian Teachers (εὐαγγελισται) on their travels, who had been known elsewhere to Paul, and were then merely staying at Rome with the Assistants, who accompanied them. So might have been Philologus, Julias, Nereus, and Olympas, because they were greeted together with πάσι ἁγιοῖς συν αὐτοῖς (xvi. 15.)—unless indeed a par

the Roman Community to have consisted of Gentile Christians, the objection arising from Acts xxviii. 16., &c. will likewise be removed. The smaller proportion of Jewish Christians probably belonged to the poorer classes, about whose conduct and impulses the Chiefs and rich Members troubled themselves but little. Paul, therefore, fearing their political connexions in Rome, only called the πρωτοι to him; and these spoke to him in the style, which was usual to principal Jews. Hence, Flatt rightly infers, that the Epistle was written before his journey to Rome.

Paul mentioned his intention of going from Jerusalem to Rome (Rom. xv. 23, 24.) which intention Luke also records in Acts xix. 21. He travelled indeed from Ephesus through Macedonia, and went from thence to Greece, where he continued three months, the greatest part of which time he spent at Corinth, because it had been his design to revisit that city (1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3. 5—7.), and from thence to bear the collection to Jerusalem. (verse 4.) Now, we observe, that in the Epistle to the Romans he delivers a salutation from Erastus, the Chamberlain of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23. cf., 2 Tim. iv. 20.; 1 Cor. i. 14.), and from Caius (Rom. xvi. 23.; 1 Cor. i. 15.), who also lived there, and that he recommends Phœbe, a Deaconess of the Church at Cenchreæ, a suburb on the eastern harbour of Corinth, (Rom. xvi. 1.), to receive the Roman Christians with hospitality. All of this proves Corinth to

of שלוש, and Tertius and Silas to have been the same person.

We have in the Canon of the New Testament only two Epistles written by Paul to the Corinthians. But it is argued by Hug and others, from 1 Cor. v. 9., that he must at least have written three, and by Weber, that he must have written five, of which that noticed in 1 Cor. v. 9. was the first,—the second being our present first, the third the greater part of our present second (viz. 2 Cor. i—ix. xiii. 12—14), the fourth that which we call the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the fifth the remainder of our second Epistle (viz. 2 Cor. x. 1.—xiii. 11.) In the first part of the Seventeenth Century, two Apocryphal Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians were indeed discovered in Armenian, which were translated into Greek and Latin, and furnished with preface, notes, and illustrations by William and George Whiston, who added at the side an Arabic version procured from Aleppo: but these were evidently the productions of a later date, and were essentially different from the Apostle's style. In fact, the whole account of these supposititious Epistles rests merely on tradition, and has no better voucher than the passage cited above from his first genuine Epistle, which has been shewn in the notes to be capable of a different meaning, and not necessarily to contain an allusion to any preceding writing to that Church.

Paul must have written the first either in Ephesus or its neighbourhood; he could not have indited it at Philippi in Macedonia, as some have falsely concluded from chap. xvi. 5.: for at xvi. 8. he says, ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, and sends salutations (ver. 19.) from Aquila and Priscilla, who were then resident in that city (Acts xviii. 19. 24. 26.) According to ch. iv. 17. he had shortly before sent Timothy to Corinth, which must have been but a very short time previously; for, when he had finished the Epistle, he did not calculate on his arrival at Corinth as yet, as we may perceive from xvi. 10., ἐὰν ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος, βλέπετε ἵνα ἀφόβως γένηται πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Now the Acts of the Apostles (xix. 22.) show, that he sent Timothy together with Erastus from Ephesus to Corinth, and the other circumstances prove, that the same mission is the subject of both passages.

He wrote it at the end of his nearly two years and a half's residence in Ephesus; for, as he intended to remain there until Pentecost (xvi. 8.), and to stay some considerable time in Corinth (ver. 7.), and even to pass the winter there (ver. 6.), he must have written it between the end of the winter and the Pentecost. This is confirmed by ch. v. 7, 8., which proves, that whilst Paul was writing it, the Passover was approaching, but still was so far distant, that Paul could calculate on the arrival of his Epistle at Corinth at the actual beginning of the festival, or during

the eight days of its continuance. The end of Paul's two years and a half's residence in Ephesus took place at the beginning of A.D. 58, consequently, this Epistle must have been composed two or three weeks before the Passover of this year. Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaïcus were probably its Bearers.

Bolten assigns to it an Aramæan original, and Bertholdt does not account Ziegler's objections to this hypothesis valid or convincing:—the former indeed argues from ch. xi. 10. and xv. 8., to the existence of translational errors. He observes, that ἐξουσια is indisputably the Aramæan word שלטניא, which according to Buxtorf is equivalent to שביס, *a particular sort of veil*, and that we are not to suppose, because the Vulgate translated it *velamen*, and Theodoret explained it καλυμμα, that the Hellenists generally called that sort of veil, ἐξουσια, which the Aramæans termed שלטניא. This could not be the case, for ἐξουσια is not a translation of שלטניא, but of שלטנת *dominatus*: hence he, who rendered this Epistle into Greek, could have been alone guilty of the error: for had Paul written it in Greek, it could not possibly have occurred, as there can be no doubt, that he would have used some Greek word expressive of a *veil*. In ch. xv. 8., ὡσπερ ἐκτρωματι, likewise, not only loses its repulsive nature, but becomes more striking, if we suppose a slight error of the Translator. Paul wrote חמא (from חמא *peccavit*) which is used to designate *a*

i. 15. ἵνα δευτέραν χαρὶν ἔχητε, which he says in reference to his former journey, adding, that this journey would stimulate him to declare to them *a second time* the doctrines of the Gospel (ver). Consequently he wrote this shortly after the first, probably also in the year 58.

In the present subscription of this Epistle, Philippi in Macedonia is stated as the place of its composition. This is, however, improbable; for as Paul was most likely landed at Philippi (Acts xx. 6.), we must presume from his mention of his success on his journey, that he had proceeded farther into Macedonia, levying the collection, before he wrote it. (viii. 1., &c.) He also waited in vain some time in Macedonia for the arrival of Titus (vii. 5.), and the uneasiness, which he felt on this occasion, did not certainly allow him to remain long at Philippi, the object of his journey being to reach Corinth as soon as possible. Hence Royaard conjectures, that he first went from Philippi further into Macedonia, visiting the several Churches, and returned again to Philippi, where he wrote this Epistle. But much more than a half year would have been requisite for this, which other chronological difficulties refute. It is more probable, that it was written in the place where Titus met him, during the progress of his journey from one Macedonian Church to the other. Its broken and irregular style, its interchange of feelings and affections, &c. denote it to have been composed,

whilst he was in the habit of meeting with persons of all descriptions, with agreeable and disagreeable occurrences and labours on his journey.

Bertholdt supposes this likewise to have been dictated in Aramaic, and to have been immediately translated into Greek by one of his assistants, which will account for the difference of style between this and the first. For, its diction is far more impure in the Greek, and is in no one of Paul's Epistles so faulty as in this. Sosthenes translated the first into Greek, and Timothy is mentioned together with Paul at the beginning of the second, who is, therefore, doubtless its Translator. He probably translated also the Epistles to the Philippians and the Colossians, in which the diction is better, but these were written much later, and Timothy might in the meanwhile have improved his Greek style. Bolten fancies, that here and there in the Greek text of the Epistle, he perceives the individual style of Luke, and thence supposes, that in this Epistle Paul had partly made use of him as an interpreter, in addition to Timothy. It is certainly conceivable, that Paul, who had dictated his Epistle in the course of his journey through Macedonia, should not have always had the services of Timothy, who may have remained behind, here and there, and, therefore, as he desired the Epistle to be forwarded to Corinth as soon as possible, that

he should then have committed the translation of it to Luke, who was with him. Paul indeed appears also alternately to have used two interpreters in the two Epistles to the Thessalonians. Yet, since in all the different parts of the second Epistle to the Corinthians the same peculiar words and phrases occur, (as Ziegler has shewn,) we cannot but believe that Timothy alone translated it.

When Paul wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, he was in bonds (i. 7. 13. 17.)—in the place, where he was, a πραιτωριον (i. 13.) and the οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος were:—there was likewise a Christian Church there (iv. 22.) He also hoped, that his fortunes would take a favourable turn, that he might recover his freedom and be enabled to visit the Philippians, (i. 26, 27.) Yet he considered this still so far distant, as to have calculated, that Timothy, whom in the assured anticipation of his improved condition, he promised to send to Philippi, (ii. 19—23.) would have long before returned to him, and have brought to him joyful accounts of the flourishing state of the Philippian community. For that was already instituted in due form: it had its Ἐπισκοποι and Διακονοι, (i. 1.)

The building at Rome, in which since the time of Tiberius the Imperial Body-guard was lodged (Sueton. Tiber. c. 36. Tacit. Ann. iv. 2. 40. Plin. Hist. Nat. xxv. 2. Sueton. Ner. c. 7.)

was called PRÆTORIUM, and as it is natural to suppose the οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος to have been the imperial palace at Rome, it is very presumptive, that this Epistle was written during Paul's first or second imprisonment there. Yet from these two names alone this assertion cannot be positively certain. For in all the Capitals of the Provinces, there were also *Prætoria*, because the official residences of the Governors in the Provinces, which might also have borne the title, implied as much, (Cicer. Verr. iv. 28. v. 35.) from thence also all great and splendid buildings in cities, even those belonging to landed proprietors, even if they were no part of the State-property. (Juven. x. 161. Suet. Aug. 72. Tiber. 39. Calig. 37.) Moreover, the οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος must not necessarily be understood of the Imperial Palace at Rome, for each great public building, each *Prætorium*, which was the property of the State during the Empire of the Cæsars, might be denominated οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος. Nor do Paul's words necessarily imply, that he was in the place, where the οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος was: for he is speaking of persons belonging to the οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος, who might have been with him in another place. Hence all the expositors are far from being agreed, that Paul wrote this Epistle at Rome.

Oeder concluding from chap. i. 5, 6., that Paul had but shortly before founded the Church at Philippi, imagined, that the place of its composition must have been a City, in which he re-

sided for some considerable time after his departure from Philippi. But from Philippi he went after a short stay in Thessalonica, to Berœa, Athens, and Corinth, in which last place he continued a year and a half. (Acts xviii. 1—18.) In this city he received the present of the Philippians, by the hands of Epaphroditus, and from hence he sent him back to them with this Epistle. A Proconsul resided in Corinth: there was doubtless also there a *Prætorium*, and those ἐκ τῆς Καισαρος οἰκιας (ch. iv. 22.) from whom he sends salutations, were probably *Ministri et famulares Cæsaris*, who were to be found in Achaia, as well as in all the other Provinces of the Roman Empire. During this residence of Paul at Corinth, he was seized by the Jews, fettered, and thus dragged before the Tribunal of the Proconsul Gallio, by whom he was set at liberty, and in whose presence the Jewish accusers were beaten by the Gentile inhabitants, which necessarily inspired the Christians with fresh courage. To this he alludes in ch. i. 12—14.:—where Oeder attempts to explain the δεσμοι, as those, with which the Jews fettered him on this occasion.

Ingenious, however, as this hypothesis is, it is nevertheless inadmissible. Luke says nothing of Paul being fettered by the Jews, and being thus dragged before the Tribunal of Gallio. The Jews had neither the means nor the power of doing this. Besides, Paul certainly was still in chains, when he wrote the Epistle, as it is mani-

fest from chap. i. 17. But how could he here have alluded to any fetters at Corinth, which at most he could not have borne for two hours? Nor does his hope of soon visiting them argue his liberty at that time. In ch. i. 7., he speaks of a defence which he had made, when in bonds; but this is in direct contradiction to his apprehension before Gallio: he on that occasion, indeed, wished to defend himself, but the Proconsul would not allow him to speak, and instantly dismissed the case. The Heretics also at Corinth were very similar to those described in this Epistle, and it is clear from the first Epistle to the Corinthians, that these were not found there, until Paul's departure from Corinth. Nor can it be inferred from chap. i. 5, 6., that the Epistle was written in the first or second year after the establishment of the Church at Philippi: for, ἀπο πρωτης ἡμερας ἀχρι τοῦ νῦν may denote a period of several years, and though ἐναρξαμενος refers to the beginning of the Christian Church, it cannot be inferred from ἐπιτελεσει, that it was not regularly perfected; since it already had Bishops, Deacons (i. 1.) and Deaconesses (iv. 2.), whom Paul so advantageously describes in the Epistle, that we might believe, that there was no other Church at that time so well regulated and appointed as the Philippian. Ἐπιτελεσει therefore, refers not to its *outward* constitution, but to the spiritual and moral perfection of its members, who (as Paul wished) were advancing by God's co-operation, in a constant preparation for the second advent of Christ.

The celebrated Paulus conjectured Cæsarea in Palestine, where Paul was detained for two years (Acts xxiii. 23.;—xxvi. 32.) to have been the place of its composition, where he received the pecuniary present of the Philippians, by the hands of Epaphroditus, from which city also he sent him back to them with this Epistle. He understands the πραιτωριον, which is the same as the οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος, to have been the πραιτωριον τοῦ Ἡρωδου (Acts xxiii. 35.) which at that time was a public prison, in which Paul remained with the others, who were in confinement there. Consequently, the composition of the Epistle falls in that period, when Paul (Acts xxiv. 23.) was hardly treated by Felix the Procurator, for, then he knew not whether his imprisonment would end in death or liberty. (i. 21—25.; ii. 17.) The ἀπολογια, which Paul mentions in chap. i. 7. must therefore be understood of the defence which he made against the accusations of Tertullus the Advocate before Felix. (Acts xxiv. 1—22.)

To this, however, Bertholdt objects, that Paul, as a Roman citizen had appealed to Cæsar, that he must have known so much of the Roman Criminal Code, as to have entertained no apprehensions of his Execution at Cæsarea. Nor can such apprehensions be collected from chap. i. 21—25. and ii. 17., even if he were then really a Prisoner at Cæsarea. For he probably knew from the Roman Legal Praxis, that as

soon as a Roman citizen, who was a prisoner, had appealed to the Emperor, the power of all inferior Courts in the Provinces was at an end, and it was necessary, that he should be brought before the Supreme Authority in Rome (Acts xxvi. 32.) Besides, if Paul was among those, who had been arrested in the *Prætorium* of Herod, which mostly consisted of bad men, how could he state to the Philippians, as a circumstance creditable to Christianity, that ἐν ὁλῳ τῷ Πραιτωριῳ his cause was acknowledged to be good and noble? Lastly, Palestine was so distant from Philippi, that we cannot easily imagine, how the Philippians could have heard of the illness of Epaphroditus, how Paul could again have received accounts on the subject from Philippi, and how when he sent back Epaphroditus with this Epistle, he could have promised the speedy mission of Timothy, and have expressed the hope of Timothy's quick return to him from Philippi with good tidings, without at least allowing two years for all this.

But the received opinion, that it was written in Rome, is not merely founded on the subscription of the Epistle, but on ancient tradition, which the Epistle itself verifies. The Πραιτωριον then will most easily imply the Barracks of the Imperial Guards (the Prætorian) into which Paul was received, as all prisoners brought from the Provinces to Rome usually were. The οἰκια τοῦ Καισαρος was most probably the same building,

not the Imperial Palace, nor even the ordinary Imperial Residence. For it is hardly to be conceived, that Paul had acquired such friends among the officers of Nero's Court, yet it is very credible, that he might have acquired proselytes among the Prætorians, during his confinement in the Prætorium. But if he was afterwards permitted to hire a private house (Acts xxviii. 30.); free entrance was granted to all, and he had daily one or other of the Prætorians to guard him:—and as he harangued in his chambers on the doctrines of Christianity, he could scarcely fail of converting either one or another of them. These therefore were those ἐκ τῆς Καισαρος οἰκιας (iv. 22.) from whom he sends greetings.

Paul was twice in Rome as a Prisoner, and in this Epistle he asserts the hope of soon recovering his liberty:—but as he could have had no such a hope, during his *second* captivity, consequently, it must have been written during his *first* in the year of our Lord 63. Epaphroditus appears to have been its bearer, whom Grotius and some others have erroneously identified with Epaphras. It was probably written in Aramaic, and translated by Timothy. Some have supposed it to have been written in Greek from the paronomasia in κατατομη, and περιτομη, in iii. 2, 3., but the same is the case in Aramaic, περιτομη being גוירתא or נחרתא, and κατατομη גורא.

There has been as equal dispute concerning

the place, where the Epistle to the Colossians was composed: the subscription of the Coptic version mentions Athens, and Erasmus supposes Ephesus. Paul however was neither a prisoner in Athens nor Ephesus, but the Epistle positively mentions him to have been somewhere in confinement (c. iv. 3. 18.) when he wrote it. Hence, it has been generally conceived, that he indited it during his first imprisonment in Rome. Yet, because it was written at the same time and place, as that to the Ephesians, Oeder would prove, that neither could have been written at Rome, nor at that late period, when his imprisonment at Rome took place, but that it must have been composed many years before, in some other place where he was imprisoned. For, because he writes (Eph. i. 13. 15, 16.) that he incessantly thanked God for the accounts which had been transmitted to him of the Ephesians having received the Gospel, and because it is implied in Eph. ii. 11. 13. 19., that they were shortly before Heathens; and also because, according to Eph. iii. 2., he was doubtful, whether they had heard that his Apostolic office had been conferred upon him by God, Oeder conceives it to be most clear, that the Epistle to the Ephesians and the cotemporary Epistle to the Colossians, were written before his long residence in Ephesus, consequently before A.D. 56. This, however, is a fallacy, because it proceeds from the hypothesis, that the Epistle to the Ephesians was designed for the Ephesians alone, whereas it was a circular

to sevetal Churches, which neither Paul nor his assistants had established, of whose existence he had but lately heard, and thus was naturally doubtful, whether they knew any thing of him or his Apostolicoffice.

He may have therefore written the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians during his imprisonment at Rome, with which the ancient Ecclesiastical Tradition, which is preserved in the Greek subscription, accords. But the subscription also adds, that this Epistle was brought to Colossæ by Tychicus and Onesimus. The Epistle however to Philemon was brought to Colossæ by Onesimus, a fugitive slave of that place: hence both must have been written and despatched at the same time: for even in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 7—9.) Tychicus and Onesimus are noticed as its Deliverers. The Epistle to the Ephesians likewise must have been written and sent away at the same period, because Tychicus is mentioned in it (Eph. vi. 21, 22.) as its Bearer. The proofs, that the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon were cotemporary, are these. In both, Epaphras was with Paul, at the time of their composition (Col. iv. 12.; Philem. vers. 23.) according to both the same persons were with him, during his confinement, viz. Aristarchus, Mark, Luke, and Demas (Col. iv. 10, 11. 14.; Philem. ver. 24.), Justus alone, who was surnamed Jesus, not being mentioned in that to Philemon; this omission, however, is easily con-

ceivable, for, as both Epistles were certainly not written in one day nor in one week, he might either not yet have joined Paul at Rome, or may have left it, or have been absent from it for a short time.

Hence it may be accounted certain, that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Colossians at Rome; but is it to be dated in his first or second Imprisonment? We must determine in favour of the first, because Timothy was with Paul, when he composed this Epistle and that to Philemon. (Col. i. 1. Phil. ver. 1.) But he was not with him during his second, nor can the presence of Tychicus, Epaphras, and Onesimus, at Rome be referred to the second. The Apostle's well-founded hope of a speedy liberation (Phil. ver. 22.) harmonizes with the first, whereas he never could have indulged it in his second. Now, as in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 3.) he merely allows *the wish* for his liberation to escape him, we have possibly a ratio, by which we may compute the period of his first imprisonment in which it was written, and the order and gradation of time, in which the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, followed each other. *That to the Ephesians* was written the first, in Bertholdt's opinion; then *that to the Colossians*, and after some interval, during which the departure of Tychicus and Onesimus was nearly arranged, and Paul had obtained prospects of his speedy deliverance, *that to Philemon*, the shortness of which leads us to suppose

that Paul had not time to write more. Consequently, the Epistle to the Colossians was despatched in the last period of his first Roman Imprisonment: it could not have been despatched in the first part of it, because Timothy was in Rome when he wrote it, (Col. i. 1.) and he was not with him when he was sent from Cæsarea to Rome. (Acts xxvii. 2.) Some time, therefore, must have elapsed, ere he joined the Apostle in Rome: hence the Epistle could not have been written before A.D. 62: although it was certainly written in the course of that year, and brought to its destination by Tychicus and Onesimus.

Because the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians were composed so nearly at the same time, their great similarity, and their frequent verbal agreements, may satisfactorily be explained. Bertholdt conceives, that to the Colossians to have likewise been written in Aramaic, and to have been translated by Timothy.

The first Epistle to the Thessalonians was written, when Timothy, whom Paul had sent back from Athens to Thessalonica, (1 Thess. iii. 1, 2.) had returned to him. (6.) This, however, happened some time after his arrival at Corinth, (Acts xviii. 5., Cf. ver. 1.) and it is evident from ἀρτι δε ἐλθοντος Τιμοθεου προς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν, that it was written immediately after Timothy's return. Michaelis fixed its date in the last period of his year and a half's residence in Co-

rinth, (Acts xviii. 11.), on the authority of ch. i. 7, 8., whence he concluded, that after his departure from Thessalonica, he must have gone to the neighbouring countries: (*e. g.* to Crete)—this, however, might have taken place during this long residence in Corinth, for we readily suppose him to have made some neighbouring journies, not commemorated by Luke, during this space of time. This being admitted, no proof in support of his conjecture arises from 1 Thess. i. 7, 8., for ἐν παντι τοπῳ is necessarily restricted to the limits of Macedonia and Achaia.

After having examined another equally unsupported theory of Michaelis, he infers, that the Epistle must have been written and sent off during the first period of his residence in Corinth, but not during the first few weeks of it. For then Paul was pursuing the trade of a σκηνοποιος with Aquila and Priscilla, and had taught for several Sabbaths in the Jewish Synagogue, ere Timothy arrived with Silas from Thessalonica. (Acts xviii. 1—5.) Hence, he appears to have written it in the second or third month of his stay at Corinth, in the first quarter of A.D. 54. The bearer of it is unknown.

The second Epistle to the Thessalonians was composed in the same place, soon after the first: for Timothy was still with Paul, (2 Thess. i. 1.) but after his departure from Corinth, which took place in company with Aquila and Priscilla alone, (Acts xvii. 18.), he was not in his society

for a considerable time. Consequently, its date falls in the same year as that of the first.

In ch. iii. 2., however, he speaks of wicked opponents, from whom he desires to be delivered, of whom he says nothing in the first. Hence it has been conjectured, that when he wrote this Epistle, he had removed from Corinth and proceeded to some other place. For, during his residence in Corinth, we read of no other opponents, than those resident Jews, who would not receive Christianity. (Acts xviii. 1—17.) Consequently, the ἀνθρωποι ἀτοποι και πονηροι (2 Thess. iii. 2.), were not Jews, but nominal Christians, because Paul says of them, that they had not the orthodox faith (οὐ γαρ παντων ἡ πιστις.) By these words he every where designates his opponents in general, viz. the Judaizing Christian Teachers from Palestine, who every where opposed the extension of his universal principles. For, at ver. 1. he writes in reference to these, προσευχεσθε, ἀδελφοι, περι ἡμῶν, ἱνα ὁ λογος τοῦ Κυριου τρεχῃ, και δοξαζηται, καθως και προς ὑμᾶς, and it is manifest, that he is not speaking, at ver. 2., of opponents *in his residence at that time*, but of those heterodox Brethren, whom he anticipated *elsewhere*. His departure from Corinth might from this passage be concluded to have been determined, when he wrote the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Grotius hazarded the conjecture, that it might

have been written earlier than the first, and have been intended for the few Jewish Christians, who were in Thessalonica. But as the Emperor Caius is designated as Antichrist (ii. 3. &c.) which he could not have publicly done, as long as the house of Julius was possessor of the throne, consequently, not before Galba; hence the Epistle which was written last, but was the first in circulation, was by some accounted the first. The reason was, that Paul (2 Thess. iii. 17.) had added some words with his own hand, which he cited as the criterion of all his authentic Epistles: and how (says Grotius) could Paul have written this to the Thessalonians, if they had already received an Epistle from him? Paul, however, was only desirous of *drawing their attention* to the criterion of his authentic Epistles, which was necessary, because a spurious one had found its way among them, which from want of this autographical addition they had been unable to detect.

To these two Epistles likewise an Aramæan original is attributed. Bolten supposes the existence of a translational error in 2 Thess. i. 7. where ἄνεσις is said to be an incorrect interpretation of an Aramæan word, which Paul might have written ומחא (in the place of מחיא. *Part. Aphel* of חיא, *vixit, in vita servatus est*) because the [1] anti-

[1] If there be any antithesis to ἄνεσις, it is θλῖψις in the preceding verse.

thesis with θλιβρος in verse 9., seems to require it; —his translator however might have read it נחא (*quies, requies,* from נח *quiescere*) and deeming it to be a noun, might have rendered the passage, και υμιν τοις θλιβομενοις ανεσιν (*scil.* ανταποδουναι) instead of και υμας τους θλιβομενους ζωογονων. Bertholdt rightly disputes this absurd and incorrect criticism (if indeed it be worthy of the name of criticism) as well as the inference from his objection to 1 Thess. ii. 18. Timothy and Sylvanus were the Bearers of both Epistles.

We are now arrived at that division of the Epistles, to which Bertholdt has given the name of *Pastoral* or *Private Epistles,* viz. those to Timothy and Titus; for as the Jews called their teachers רעים *pastors,* so the Christians denominated their's ποιμενες or *Pastores,* which became their most general appellation in the Christian Church.

In the discussion of these, we are forced to omit a vast body of useful and ingenious preliminary matter, to which Hug owes many of his remarks upon them, from which Bertholdt determines the date of the first Epistle to Timothy to have been A.D. 58., and presumes it to have been written in the interval between Paul's departure from Corinth (Acts xx. 3.) and his arrival in Macedonia (ver. 6.) The place of its composition is unknown; for Luke describes this journey in very few words, and

does not name the places, at which he touched, or stayed a few days, until his arrival at Philippi; it is therefore possible, that he may have composed it in one of these places, where he may have halted on his road.

The later Greek subscription says, ἀπο Λαοδικειας, ἠτις ἐστι μητροπολις Φρυγιας τῆς Πακατιανῆς. But it is very evident that it could not have been written at Laodicea in Phrygia, because Paul did not visit Phrygia, either on his way from Ephesus to Corinth, or on his return from Corinth by way of Philippi, Troas, and Miletus. Curiosity, however, may incite us to know the origin of this hypothesis, which seems merely to be an exegetical inference. The ancients rightly perceived, that the Heretics of whom he speaks in it in the plural number, were of the same description as those, against whom the Epistle to the Colossians was directed,—that they were Christian teachers inclined to the opinions of the Essenes. According to the Epistle to the Colossians (ii. 1.) there were some of them in Laodicea. Yet, since it is clear from the Epistle to the Colossians, that Paul never was at Colossæ, and since, on the other hand, Col. iv. 16. and the passage just quoted, (certainly from an incorrect antithesis of οἱ ἐν Λαοδικειᾳ and ὁσοι οὐκ ἑωρακασι το προσωπον μου) seem to suppose a former personal residence of Paul at Laodicea, and since Paul so accurately depicts these Opponents and Heretics in the first

Epistle to Timothy, and that to the Colossians, that we might believe him to have seen them somewhere or another, the hypothesis may have arisen, that surrounded by these Heretics he wrote the first Epistle to Timothy in Phrygian Laodicea:—and as the ancients did not incommode their conjectures by chronological researches, this opinion may have easily obtained an almost general assent.

Paulus endeavoured to prove, that Paul wrote it during his confinement at Cæsarea, (Acts xxiii. 23., &c.) He supposes Timothy to have visited Paul at Cæsarea, to have been sent by him from thence to Ephesus, to counteract certain Heretics in that city, and there to have received this Epistle from him, in which he commissions him to go to Macedonia, for the purpose of opposing in that place also these Heretics, and of being watchful over the observation of Ecclesiastical order. Such he conceives to be the meaning of the commencing words of the Epistle: for (ver. 3.) πορευομενος εἰς Μακεδονιαν should relate to Timothy, and ἱνα should be accepted in an imperative sense (as in 1 Cor. xvi. 10. Eph. v. 33.) whence the whole passage would have this force: *sicuti suasor monitorque tibi fui, ut dum Ephesi esses, perseverares (morareris ibi, perstares permaneresque in* παραγγελια *Christiano-Paulina) ita in Macedoniam proficiscens fac edicas istis qualibuscunque, ne diversa*

à nostris doceant. This theory, however, with its other particulars, Bertholdt has refuted.

Usher, Mill, Pearson, Clericus, and Paley conceived its composition to have taken place between Paul's first and second imprisonment at Rome. They have supposed, that he executed the resolution, which he had formed during his first confinement, of going to Asia Minor and Macedonia (Philem. ver. 22.; Phil. i. 23—26., ii. 24.) that on this journey, he left Timothy behind him at Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3.) and afterwards sent to him this Epistle. According to this we might even defend the declaration of the Subscription, that Paul wrote it at Laodicea in Phrygia. He might have gone inland from Ephesus and taken the circuitous road to Macedonia by way of Laodicea, and written the Epistle to Timothy during his stay in that city, or on his return from Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20.) by way of Macedonia and Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13.) he might have taken from this city the direction to Phrygia, for the sake of at last becoming acquainted with the Churches there, which were unknown to him, have written the letter to Timothy in Laodicea, and announced to Timothy in it his speedy arrival at Ephesus (iii. 14.; iv. 13.) have actually gone to Ephesus, embarked at Miletus, where he left Trophimus ill, (2 Tim. iv. 22.) and at last arrived at Rome, where he was a second

time imprisoned. (2 Tim. i. 16.) Thus certainly is the whole connected, and according to neither exposition would the words πορευομενος εις Μακεδονιαν suffer violence.

But other reasons preclude us from referring this Epistle to so late a period. It must decidedly have been written at a time, when the Ephesian Christians were as yet united in no well-arranged Community, when they had no Επισκοποι nor Πρεσβυτεροι, nor Διακονοι: hence, it must have been composed before Paul's arrival at Miletus with the Ephesian Presbyters. (Acts xx. 25—38.) Even this hypothesis does not rest on a historical basis: because Timothy was not with Paul at the last period of his first Roman imprisonment, for he had sent him to Macedonia. (Phil. ii. 16.) Yet, according to this hypothesis, Timothy must have arrived with Paul at Ephesus from Rome, because Paul could not otherwise have left him behind at his departure. (1 Tim. i. 3.) Timothy also was then certainly so far advanced in years, that Paul could no longer fear that any one would object his youth to him, (1 Tim. iv. 12.) for which reasons we must reject this hypothesis as untenable, which we may the more easily, as its aid is in no wise necessary.

Paul certainly wrote the second Epistle to Timothy at Rome; for he says in ch. i. 17. that Onesiphorus diligently sought after him there, and in ch. iv. 21. he sends salutations from the

members of that Church. At this period however he was in chains, as we may perceive from ch. i. 16.; ii. 10.; iv. 6. 16—18.

In his previous observations this writer has shewn, that it was written during his *second* imprisonment, the end of which can be chronologically determined, for it ended with his decapitation, A.D. 67. If, as some would argue from ch. iv. 6., the Epistle was written but a short time before his death, its date also must be A.D. 67. Yet this conclusion is far from being certain, for he might merely have been apprehensive, that the close of his process was at hand, and in c. iv. 9., he enjoins Timothy to hasten to him at Rome. If there be any foundation for the ancient Ecclesiastical Tradition, that Timothy was present at his Decapitation, the Epistle must have been written a considerable time before; for we must allow some interval for its arrival in Ephesus or some other city of Asia Minor, and for Timothy's journey to Rome, consequently, we must refer its composition to A.D. 66.

Baronius, Lightfoot, Lardner, Hammond, Cave, Witsius, and Heinrichs, have, however, assigned it to the period of the first imprisonment, in support of which they allege, that at the *commencement* of it Timothy was not with Paul (Acts xxvii. 2.) that he was not with him *till some time afterwards* (Col. i. 1.; Phil. i. 1.; Philem. ver. 1.) and that his arrival was probably

in consequence of an Epistle sent to him (2 Tim. iv. 9.)—that in his first imprisonment, Luke was with him (Acts xxvii. 1., &c.) and that Tychicus was sent with several Epistles to Ephesus, and farther into Asia Minor (Col. iv. 7, 8. 14.; Philem. ver. 24.) that, when he wrote his *second* Epistle, Luke was *actually* with him, and that he had shortly before sent Tychicus to Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 11, 12.) Notwithstanding which, these arguments prove nothing: for, according to the historical narrative, Timothy was *for the first time* at Rome, when Paul wrote the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon; but in the second Epistle to Timothy, he is saluted (chap. iv. 21.) by four Roman Christians as an acquaintance, consequently, he must have been in Rome *before*. This took place during his *first* imprisonment, when Paul wrote those Epistles, therefore his journey to Rome in consequence of Paul's summons in the *second* Epistle (iv. 9.) must have been *a second journey*, which cannot be placed at any period, but that of the Apostle's *second* imprisonment there. The mission also of Tychicus (ch. iv. 12.) from Rome to Ephesus was incontrovertibly different from that, which he undertook for the purpose of bearing the Epistle to the Colossians to the place of its destination: for, when Tychicus was dispatched with this Epistle, Timothy was with Paul in Rome (Col. i. 1.; Philem. ver. 1.) During Paul's *first* imprisonment (for Luke says nothing of it) he was either not examined, or his imprisonment

ended with his examination. But in the second Epistle to Timothy, he mentions a very severe examination, after which he still remained a prisoner, without any prospect of liberation (iv. 16. 21.) According to chap. iv. 20., on his journey to Rome, he had left Trophimus ill at Miletus: now, this could not have happened on that journey, when he conversed at Miletus with the Ephesian Presbyters; (Acts xx. 17, &c.) for Trophimus arrived with him at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 29.; ch. xx. 4.) But after Paul's removal from Cæsarea to Rome, he did not come by way of Miletus, according to Luke's circumstantial Itinerary:—and Beza's conjecture (2 Tim. iv. 20.) that ἐν Μελιτῃ should be read for ἐν Μιλητῳ deserves not the least consideration. All this amounts to a demonstration, that another journey of Paul, and indeed one later than that narrated by Luke in Acts xxvii. 1. &c. preceded the composition of the second Epistle to Timothy which was written in Rome, that, consequently Paul *twice* travelled to Rome, that he was each time there a prisoner, and that this second Epistle must have been written during his *second* imprisonment in that city. Equally contrary to History and the Epistle itself (i. 17.; iv. 21.) is the hypothesis, that it was written *during* his imprisonment at Cæsarea.

To both of these again Bolten requires the *concession* of an Aramaic original, with this *difference*, that he believes them to have been sent

in this language to Timothy, and to have been translated by him into Greek for the general use of the Asiatic Community. Bertholdt however supposes Paul, having also intended them for the benefit of the Ephesians and the Inhabitants of the neighbouring country, to have desired one of his interpreters to perform this office, and maintains, that as Luke *alone* was with him, when he wrote both (Acts xx. 5.; 2 Tim. iv. 11.) no one else could have translated them, which he deems confirmed, by their remarkable resemblance to Luke's style. Bolten conceives an error of translation to be discoverable in 2 Tim. iii. 2. in the words γονευσιν ἀπειθεῖς; for he cannot imagine, that among such *very general* complaints, one of so particular a nature, which could only be exemplified in very few instances, should have occurred. He would therefore substitute τινι or μηδενι, because אנשא, which indeed signifies γονεῖς in Luke ii. 41.; 3 Maccab. vi. 13. and the Peshito, more commonly means in the singular, any one. The Translator, therefore, might easily have mistaken Paul's idea:—ἀπειθεῖς indeed alone stands in the parallel passage in the Epistle to Titus (iii. 3.) Yet it is to be observed, that אנש seems only to have had this double sense in the Western Aramæan dialect.

Several attempts have been made to refer the Epistle to Titus to the period of Paul's second or third journey, of which Bertholdt has diffusely disapproved in those previous remarks, which, from their length, are indispensably omitted.

Heinrichs conjectures, that when Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia by way of Troas (Acts xx. i.), he probably met Titus at Nicopolis on the Nestus (2 Cor. vii. 6. 13, 14.), and took him with him to Corinth, (Acts xx. 2, 3.) that during his three months' residence at Corinth, he made a short voyage to Crete in company with Titus, whom he left in the Island, and returned himself to Corinth,—that at his departure from Corinth, he purposed to visit Syria by way of Macedonia (Acts xx. 3.), but that on his arrival at Troas, he altered his intention (Acts xx. 6.) and resolved to remain over the summer in Ephesus, and pass the following winter at Nicopolis on the Nestus, —that during the week which he remained at Troas, he wrote the Epistle to Titus, apprizing him of this arrangement. To which it is objected, that Paul certainly made no voyage from Corinth, for the sake of spending merely two or three days in Crete, and that he could not have stayed there longer, because Luke fixes his residence in Hellas only at three months: nor could he have abandoned his intention of going to Jerusalem, because the delivery of the collection was entrusted to him,—that four or five days since he had again changed his plan of remaining at Ephesus, for he sailed past it, and steered towards Syria.

When towards the end of his first Imprisonment at Rome, he perceived prospects of his liberation, he resolved to go to Philippi in Macedonia (Phil. ii. 24.): and we know from his

second Epistle to Timothy, which he wrote during his second imprisonment, that he actually went there. That he might have gone directly from Italy to Crete, and from thence to Macedonia, is indeed possible, but not very probable; because conformably to his promise he would naturally hasten to Macedonia, and the circuitous way by Crete was too long, besides which he intended, after leaving Crete, to pass the winter in Nicopolis, (Tit. iii. 12.) Hence, we assume with far greater probability, that immediately after his liberation, he went to Macedonia, and that he did not visit Crete in company with Titus until some time afterwards. From Crete he probably repaired to the coast of Asia Minor, and sent from Asia Minor the Epistle to Titus in Crete. The place where he wrote it cannot be ascertained. The Nicopolis, in which he purposed to spend the following winter (Tit. iii. 12.) seems to have been Nicopolis in Cilicia, or one of the cities of Asia Minor bearing this name; but whether or not he executed this intention we know not. In either case, he must have returned to the western parts of Asia Minor, and from thence have betaken himself to Corinth; for from Corinth he entered on his last journey to Rome by way of Macedonia, Troas, and Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 13. 20.) If then we would accurately determine the time, when he wrote the Epistle to Titus, it must be determined in this manner; the Epistle was written in the time between his liberation from his first

imprisonment at Rome, and the summer before he commenced his last journey to Rome from Corinth, (2 Tim. iv. 20.)—therefore, as he certainly arrived in Rome before the summer of the year 66, the date of this Epistle falls either in A.D. 64. or 65. Zenas and Apollos were most probably the Bearers of it.

Bolten supposes it to have been written in Aramaic, and Titus himself to have translated it, for the purpose of giving a general circulation to it. But Bertholdt urges, that as it was equally designed for the Cretan Christians in support of the authority of Titus, it must necessarily have been written in Greek, that they might be enabled to produce it as an original document. Bolten's chief argument seems to be, that the quotation from Epimenides (i. 22.), must have been interpolated by Titus when translating it, which is a conjecture too unsupported to deserve further notice.

Paul wrote the Epistle to Philemon at Rome towards the end of his first imprisonment, consequently its date falls in the year 63 of the Dionysian æra. To this also Bolten ascribes an Aramæan original.

Bertholdt assents, like Hug, to the authenticity of the second and third Epistles of John, and has with considerable ingenuity and force of argument removed the objections against

them. Lange and Eichhorn suppose, that the second may have been written before the first Epistle; the former also conjectures from the mention made of the same Heretics in it, that even if the greater Epistle were indeed composed the first, this must have referred to it. Bertholdt however inquires, can it be admitted, as a certain fact, that the Κυρια was acquainted with the first Epistle? He then argues, that as the same Heretics are controverted in both, and that as they resided in Asia Minor, there can be no doubt, that John wrote it in Ephesus, probably a very short time after the first, consequently not before A.D. 90.

Eichhorn also accounts the third Epistle to have been prior to the first, which idea is liable to the same objections, as the preceding: Bertholdt is of opinion, that it was written at Ephesus, and from the similar mention of the Apostle's projected visit (2 Ep. 12.; 3 Ep. 13, 14.) that both must have been composed at the same time. Lange conjectures, that the Κυρια and Caius lived in the same place, to which Bertholdt objects, under the notion, that in this case the Epistle to the Κυρια would have contained some mention of the hard fate of those foreign Christians, who had been banished to her place of residence, and that, in that to Caius some mention would have been made of the Heretics, where he resided; from whence he supposes, that they may have inhabited two places

so situated, that a person travelling from Ephesus would be obliged to pass through the nearer to reach the more remote. He then decides, that the writings of John were composed in Greek, and that these Epistles were written in the last years of his life, towards the end of the first Century.

We must now examine his observations on the Apocalypse, which he classes among the Poetical Books of the Bible. On account of the disputes, by which it has been assailed, we must be far more diffuse in our extracts, than we have been in those relating to the Epistles. He thus analyzes the Book:—"The seven dedicatory Epistles to the seven Churches of Asia Minor (ch. i. 4.—iii. 22.) are followed by a series of *Symbolical Visions*, in which (ch. iv. 1.—viii. 4.) first, God's preparations to raise Christianity triumphant above Judaism, then (viii. 5.—xi. 19.) the overthrow of Judaism and the *violent concussion* of Paganism which is connected with it (ix. 20.; x. 11.; xi. 18.) the subsequent utter (xii. 1.—xx. 3.) overthrow of Paganism, the universal and perfect triumph of Christianity, (xx. 4.—xxii. 5.) and the Blessedness of its professors in Earth and Heaven, are described. A postscript (xxii. 6—21.) concludes the whole."

There have been many speculations on the external form of the Book. Eichhorn supposes it to have been in the form of a Greek or Roman

drama, and to have had its acts, scenes, Exodi, prolusions, prologue and epilogue. The following is its division according to his opinion: "Chap. i.—iii. Prologue. Ch. iv. i.—viii. 5. the Prolusio. Ch. viii. 6.—xii. 17. *The first act. Judaism is conquered by Christianity.* Ch. xii. 18.—xx. 10. *The second act. Paganism is conquered by Christianity.* Ch. xx. 11.—xxii. 5. *The third act. The Christians are blessed on Larth and in Heaven.* Ch. xxii. 6—21. The Epilogue." But the whole of this hypothesis is forced, and contrary to the plan of the Book: it is arbitrarily entertained from the circumstance of Herod the Great having built theatres at Jerusalem and Cæsarea, from whence he assumes the Jews to have become acquainted with the nature of the Greek Drama, even without being able to read the Greek Tragedians. But St. John has purposely avoided every thing in the Apocalypse, which could suggest this idea to his readers: he doubtless felt the prevalent Jewish aversion to the Dramata of the Greeks and Romans, which he did not discard when he became a Christian, and would have feared to have profaned the sacred subjects, of which he was treating, by the imagery of a Heathen Drama. Hasse, on the other hand, believed similarities to be discoverable between the Apocalypse and the *Tabula Cebetis*. There is, however, no reason for not referring it to the *symbolical poetry* of the Hebrews; for it merely differs from the *symbolical portraitures* or *prophecies* which occur in the

Books of the Old Testament, and are closely copied in it, by forming a continuous series and a connected whole.

We must now consider the external arguments both in favour of the authenticity of the Apocalypse and in opposition to it. 1. In the principal countries, where Christianity maintained its chief seat in the second Century, there were testimonies in favour of the Apocalypse. 2. Consequently, the Apocalypse must have been known in all these countries in the second Century, and the tradition must have been generally circulated, that the John, to whom this writing is ascribed, was the Evangelist and Apostle of this name. 3. Even in many countries of Asia Minor, and particularly in the city of Ephesus, where John last resided, and where several of his Scholars still lived in the second Century, this Tradition was circulated, and its correctness is confirmed by those, who are known to have been intimate with the Disciples of John the Apostle. 4. This tradition could not have first existed at a considerable period after the death of John the Apostle, but it must have extended as far back as his time: for Tertullian expressly retraces it to that period, which is also corroborated even by the opinions of the most ancient Opponents of its authenticity. Had not the Presbyter Caius and the Alogi, as they are called, as well as Dionysius Alexandrinus been aware, that an incontrovertible tradition

certified the existence of this work long before the end of the first Century, they would not have sought for its author among the cotemporaries of the Apostle John, if they did not deem themselves authorized to impute it to himself, nor would they have declared Cerinthus or John the Presbyter to have been its Writer.

Yet, as no witness positively attests the reception of the Apocalypse from the hands of John the Apostle, and as it is possible, that his cotemporaries living in remote countries may have been deceived respecting its author, and have confounded him with another John, we may not with absolute certainty decide in the matter. Hence we are bound to hear the opposite arguments, more especially, as we have nothing to fear from the result of the inquiry.

1. *Since the most ancient witnesses in favour of the authenticity of the Apocalypse were either Millennarians or Montanists, so the conjecture, that merely the bias in favour of the Millennium generated the notion, that the Evangelist John was its author, is most forcibly supported. They were so very much fettered to the sensual and voluptuous expectations of Christ's reign on earth for a thousand years, that in their ardent desire to obtain the authority of the greatest of the Apostles for this expectation, they deceived themselves respecting*

the author of this writing. This error may have even occurred in remote countries during John's life, and its rapid circulation by means of the Universality of the Chiliastic ideas among the first Christians, is perfectly conceivable.—

We grant that the first Christians were absolute Millenarians: for the Judaic *Christology*, in which the Apostles invested the Christian Doctrines, induced their expectations, that Jesus, the Χριστος, would only be absent from the Earth for a short time, and would return for the purpose of establishing την βασιλειαν τῶν οὐρανων. From the same source flowed also that, which the Apostles say of the παρουσια and ἀποκαλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. For what reason then would they have been desirous of seeking a *particular* credibility and confirmation for a point, which had been *generally* believed from the earliest time, and about which no one entertained doubts?— We confound the peculiar opinions of ONE PART of the Christians in the last quarter of the SECOND Century and in the THIRD Century, with the GENERAL opinions of the Christians from the Apostolic age till beyond the middle of the second Century, if we believe the earliest Christians to have been occupied in seeking proofs of their belief in a visible reign of Christ on the Earth. With them the belief in Christ's return was an invigorating, energetic hope, but time cooled this ardour in all, and the Millennium was now merely become a doctrinal posi-

tion, which was necessary to be proved, and indeed to be proved from an inspired writing. About this time also the belief in the Millennium was adopted by the Gnostics, whence it was still more necessary to establish it on a firm evidence. They now, therefore, began to support it by the authority of inspired writings, which the earlier Christians did not, having (as Papias's example assures us) simply founded it on oral tradition. Still they were far from exclusively taking these proofs from the Apocalypse; on the contrary, other writings of the Old and New Testaments were far more frequently applied to this purpose. The Montanists alone supported their gross Millennarian Fanaticisms principally on the Apocalypse: and this was the very circumstance, which first attracted to it the suspicion of spuriousness. Before this no one had asserted a doubt of its authenticity: it was read, as a genuine work of the Apostle, John:—it was so read at a time, when as yet they had no idea of citing it in support of the Millennium. Consequently, the assertion that the propensity of the first Christians to the Chiliastic notions procured to the Apocalypse the honour of being accounted a work of the Apostle John, is false.

2. *History* (so the objectors remark) *produces an equal number of ancient witnesses against the Apocalypse, who, if they did not expressly reject it as spurious, were yet ignorant of it.*

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom, A. 106, *does not mention it in a single word of his three Epistles to the Churches at Ephesus, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, which is the more surprising, since these are among the Churches to which it is dedicated. Ignatius must necessarily have mentioned it, had it been known to him, as a genuine work of John the Apostle; for in the Epistle to the Ephesians he notices the commendations, which they had received from the Apostle Paul, which is a proof, what a great importance he attached to the praise of one of our Lord's Apostles. How then could he have omitted to mention, that the Apostle John also had spoken in the Apocalypse in commendation not only of the Ephesian community, but also of those of Philadelphia and Smyrna? The most ancient and credible accounts of Papias say nothing of his admission of the Apocalypse as a genuine and inspired book, which is equally surprising, since it is known of Papias, that he collected with great pains all the ancient traditions, and among these some perfectly unimportant, and that he was moreover a most zealous Disseminator of the Millennary Doctrine. There is also no mention of the Apocalypse in the Epistle of Polycarp, and in that of the Church at Smyrna on the death of Polycarp, which is not less extraordinary, as Polycarp was personally known to John the Apostle, and was Bishop of Smyrna, and as the Church at Smyrna was one of those, to which*

the Apocalypse was dedicated. It could not therefore have been known at Smyrna, as a genuine writing of the Apostle John. Marcion, likewise, has not inserted it in his Ἀποστολος, *and that it was not considered in Syria towards the end of the second century, as an authentic production of the Apostle John, is proved by its omission in the Peshito. The tradition, that the Apostle John was its author, must in general have been deemed very doubtful and uncertain, wherever it was circulated: otherwise, how would Caius, the Alogi, and Dionysius Alexandrinus have presumed to have pronounced Cerinthus or Johannes Presbyter, to have been its author? Lastly, if the allegorical mode of interpretation rendered common in the third century by means of Origen, had not caused the ancient uncertain legend, that John the Apostle was the author of the Apocalypse, to have been tolerated, without the Anti-Millennarian opinions, which had become more prevalent, receiving any detriment from it, the ancient, well-grounded doubts respecting its authenticity, would have gradually obtained the most decisive victory; and not merely individuals, who lived beyond the middle ages, would have declared it to be spurious, but the whole Church would have rejected it as Apocryphal, like the present Chaldæan Christians, and the Monophysites in Syria and Macedonia.*

The force of these arguments may be easily weakened, even if they may not be utterly confuted. It is true, that the Apocalypse is not men-

tioned in the Epistles of Ignatius. The estimation however of this objection is not dependent on the authenticity of these Epistles, nor has the circumstance of their no longer being in their pure and original state, but of being according to two different recensions, the one longer and the other shorter, any influence upon it. Eichhorn denies Ignatius to have written them, but he does not thereby gain an iota on the opposite side: for he must even in this case admit, that in the first half of the second Century, they were falsely attributed to Ignatius. If we be authorized to require from the *real* Ignatius, that he should necessarily have made mention of the Apocalypse in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philadelphians, and Smyrnæans, we are also authorized to exact the same from the *Pseudo*-Ignatius. Nor can we suppose, that their two editors, from Anti-Millennarian zeal, afterwards obliterated those passages in them, which mentioned the Apostolical origin of the Apocalypse, because both the existing recensions of the Epistles of Ignatius originated in a time, when there were but few Anti-Millennarians, and because we cannot suppose, that two different recensors should have coincided in such a plan. Let us, however, admit, that the Apocalypse, which had commended the communities to which they were directed, was not noticed in them.— The whole objection will then rest on the mention made of Paul's praise of the Ephesians, and the silence or suppression of that made by John, whence it is inferred, that Ignatius was either

unacquainted with the Apocalypse, or that he did not acknowledge it as a genuine work of the Apostle John. But is this conclusion valid? is it not possible that these passages of the Apocalypse may not have occurred to his memory? or was he certain, that the Apocalypse was publicly read in Ephesus, Philadelphia, and Smyrna? if he were not, could he call to the minds of the Christians at Ephesus, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, the commendation given to them in a work, about which he was far from being fully certified, that it was in as great circulation in these three cities, as that Epistle, which Paul had sent to the Ephesians, was at Ephesus? It has indeed been conceived, that the Apocalypse had been very long known and generally read in the Churches at Ephesus, Philadelphia, Smyrna, Sardis, Thyatira, Laodicea, and Pergamus, because it was dedicated to them, for it has been conceived, that John sent a copy of it to each of them. Of this, however, no writer knew any thing before Tertullian; HE *first* made the assertion, AND THIS he inferred from the seven Epistles alone.

What reason indeed have we to expect the *real* or *Pseudo*-Ignatius to have mentioned the Apocalypse? Each indeed might have supposed it to have been known at Ephesus, but not to have been publicly read there, and to have been also known at Philadelphia and Smyrna. But we shall soon find a testimony, that it was unknown in this last city, in the first half of the

second Century:—consequently, we can deduce no conclusion against its authenticity from the silence of the author of the genuine or spurious Epistles of Ignatius. Although he does not mention it, he might, nevertheless, have been well acquainted with it, and have considered it as a genuine writing of John the Apostle. Yet we have no compulsory reason obstinately to contradict *him*, who will not concede to the author of these Epistles an acquaintance with the Apocalypse. If he was not acquainted with it, what proof could be deduced from thence?—merely, that in Syria, where Ignatius lived, or in the Country, in which the inventor of these Epistles, if he was not a Syrian, resided, the Apocalypse was not in circulation at the end of the first Century, nor until about the middle of the second. But it can in no wise be demonstrated from thence, that in this first epoch the Apocalypse was not in existence. For, in proof of its early existence at this period, we have just as ancient a witness in Justin Martyr [m]. However, immediately after the end of the first half of the second Century, the Apocalypse must have been also brought to Syria, and have been known to some Teachers of this Country, since Theophilus Antiochenus also made use of it [n].

The objection which has been derived from the silence of Papias on the subject, is by no means to be regarded as a proper objection, because in

[m] Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 308. [n] Euseb. H. E. iv. 24.

the resolution of the question, whether Papias quoted it in his work as a genuine writing of John the Apostle, as much may be said on the one side as on the other, and because a historical reason can be given, why Papias made no dogmatic use of it. It may be observed, once for all, as a generally admitted fact, that an argument taken from the silence of a writer, has little or no demonstrative evidence in the scale, and it is a great error to represent a writer before the tribunal of criticism as the denier of the authenticity of a book, because he does not mention or make use of it.

The Apocalypse might certainly have been occasionally quoted in the Epistle of Polycarp; but so also might the Gospel of St. John, of which no mention also is made. Had Polycarp been speaking of the writings of the Apostle John, his silence respecting his Gospel as well as his Apocalypse would certainly have been of great importance; but who without injustice can require him to have mentioned all the Apostolical writings known to him in an Epistle consisting but of few pages, on totally different subjects? Was that general dogmatical use then made of the writings of the Apostles, as in subsequent times? The history of Doctrinal tradition denies this question. It is, however, equally as certain, that Polycarp was really acquainted with the Apocalypse, as it is probable, that he was not acquainted with it, *because he does not mention it in the*

Epistle to the Church at Smyrna. In this Epistle, which was composed in the name of the whole Smyrnæan Church, a reference to the praise given to it in the Apocalypse may probably be expected. But those who conceive that this must necessarily have been the case, if the Apocalypse were an authentic book of John the Apostle, proceed likewise from the undemonstrated position, that John sent a copy of the Apocalypse to Smyrna, as well as to the remaining Churches, to which the other Epistles were directed. How could this be? if John himself never sent this work before the public; if it was only found among his papers after his death, and would not have been published till a long time afterwards, unless the Apostle's heirs had transmitted it to the Seven Churches. If this were really the fact, nothing is easier than the explanation, why no mention of it is made either in the Epistle of Polycarp, or in the Epistle of the Church at Smyrna. At the death of Polycarp, (c. 169. A.D.) it had not yet reached Smyrna, and Polycarp himself on this account could not have been acquainted with it, because at the time of his intimacy with John, it was kept concealed by him among his papers.

Marcion certainly had not the Apocalypse, but only ten of Paul's Epistles in his Ἀποστολος, from whence it can only be proved, that about the year 140, when Marcion left the district of Pontus, the Apocalypse, as well as the other writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, which

Marcion equally had not, as yet were unknown in this province of Asia Minor.

It is granted, that it is not found in the ancient Syriac version of the New Testament, which is one of the objections, to which Hug has devoted his attention. It was, however, certainly known to *some* Syrian Christians in the second century, as the instance of Theophilus establishes beyond all contradiction, and in the fourth century it must have been almost generally received by the Syrians, because Ephræm makes an unlimited use of it.

The conduct of Presbyter Caius, of the Alogi, and Dionysius Alexandrinus, the two former of whom adduce Cerinthus as its author, and the latter Johannes Presbyter, proves in the strongest manner, that the General Tradition adjudged this Book to John the Evangelist. For, we know, that they attempted to support these assertions against the generally prevalent opinion, and that they did not make this attempt on *historical,* but solely on dogmatical and exegetical grounds.

The allegorical method of interpretation was certainly (as Origen himself concedes) applied to the refutation of the Millennarians, and was found conducive to this object; it may indeed have contributed much to diminish the Opponents of the Apocalypse, although the ge-

neral estimation, which this Book gradually obtained in the Church from the time of Origen, was not indebted to it. Unless Origen, from whom the vast host of Allegorists proceeded, had *historical* grounds, he would not have considered the Apocalypse to have been authentic, and have applied the Allegorical mode of interpretation to it. For, this style of interpretation presupposes a book of DIVINE ORIGIN, written by a PROPHET of the Old Testament, or by one of OUR LORD'S APOSTLES, and could not be applied to any other Book. The allegorical expositors must therefore have been previously convinced of its authenticity, ere they proceeded to its exposition. Consequently, their judgment respecting its authenticity cannot be determined by their subsequent discovery; viz. that the allegorical exposition of the Apocalypse destroyed all the support, which the Millennium derived from it.

It is also true, that the Apocalypse continued to have opponents for a long time, and never totally lost them. When Eusebius wrote his Ecclesiastical History, a part of the Church had just admitted it into the Canon of the New Testament; but the remaining part declared it without scruple to be spurious. Afterwards also, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, the Author of the 60th Canon of Laodicea, the composer of the Apostolic Canon, and others, did not reckon it among the

Canonical Books of the New Testament. Yet we may not presume, that they all accounted the Apocalypse to have been a *spurious* book, falsely attributed to the Apostle John, and that they had *particular historical* authorities for this opinion. The reason why they denied to it a place in the Canon, was merely, that it had not always been included among the *Libri Ecclesiastici*. This exclusion, however, from Ecclesiastical use did not arise from doubts of its authenticity, but from the nature of its contents. The Jews also excluded particular books and sections of their Canon from the public reading in their Synagogues, and reckoned them in this respect among the נגזים, without accounting them for that reason *spurious* and parts falsely inserted into the Canon. The case was the same with the Apocalypse among the Christians. The Synodic decisions at Hippo Regius (An. 393), at Carthage (An. 397), and at Toledo (An. 633) caused THE WHOLE of the Catholic Church both in the East and West from the 7th Century downwards, to assign to the Apocalypse its rightful place in the Canon; but as yet it was not raised to the rank of a *Liber Ecclesiasticus*. Yet, as some detached parties, viz. the Nestorians, or Chaldæan Christians, and the Jacobites in Syria * and Mesopotamia read

* The Chaldæan Christians read the Bible according to the Peshito, and in general receive no book of the New Testament into their Canon, which is wanting in the Peshito. They, therefore, do not account the Apocalypse canonical, merely because it is not

the Canon in its whole extent, and excluded from it all, which was not a *liber Ecclesiasticus*, we may easily perceive, why they have not now the Apocalypse in their Canon, and are certified, that they are not to be enumerated among the Deniers of its authenticity.

From the third Century, however, to the present time, attempts have been made to produce proofs from the Book itself, that John the Evangelist could not have written it. Its peculiarities of style and method, its dogmatical ideas, and some of its historical declarations have been alleged as sure criteria, that it could not have been composed by him, nor indeed have been extant in the Apostolic age. These must now pass before our scrutiny, in the refutation of which we shall be greatly indebted to Eichhorn [p].

contained in the Peshito. Hence, Ebed Jesu, one of their Teachers in the 13th century, does not include it in the New Testament, yet he does not therefore account it spurious or an interpolation. Cf. Asseman. Bibl. Or. T. iii. P. 1. p. 12.

The Monophysites in Syria and Mesopotamia read the New Testament according to the Philoxenian version, and exclude the Apocalypse alone from its Canon. The reason probably is, that at the period, when the Jacobites seceded from the Eastern Catholic Church, and formed an Ecclesiastical Society of themselves, the Apocalypse had not been generally received into the Canon of the Oriental Church. The authority of Ab'ulfaraj, who ascribed it to Cerinthus, may have greatly contributed to its exclusion by the Jacobites in subsequent times from the Canon.

[p] Ueber die innern Gründe gegen die Aechtheit und Kanonicität der Apocalypse, in S. Allgem. Bibl. der Bibl. Lit. B. 3. S. 891. ff.

1. *Dionysius Alexandrinus supported his notion, that another John was its author, from the vast difference in the diction and method, in the ideas, in the expression and connexion of them which is discernible between it and the Gospel and first Epistle of John:—observing, that in the Apocalypse the author has no scruple in naming himself several times, but that in the other two writings, as well as in the second and third Epistle he does not* NAME *himself* ONCE, *that in the Gospel he rather carefully avoids the* NECESSITY OF NAMING *himself by means of various other specifications of his person, that the writer of the Apocalypse merely plumes himself on revelations received from Jesus Christ in visions, and never says, as the Apostle John in his Gospel and first Epistle, that he had formerly been on terms of personal intimacy with him; that we miss in the Apocalypse, (which, by means of many barbarisms and solecisms, stands at the greatest possible distance from the correct style, in which the Gospel and the first Epistle of John are written,) the greatest part of the peculiar expressions and ideas, which render the Gospel and first Epistle of John recognizable as the works of one writer, and distinguish them from all other Books.*

It is assuredly correct, that the author of the Apocalypse *names himself* several times (i. 1. 4. 9.; xxii. 8.) which John never did in his Gospel and first Epistle, and that, if the two other

Epistles, which now immediately follow his first in the Canon, be justly assignable to him, it seems really to have been his plan to have avoided his own name in his writings, for in both these Epistles he merely calls himself ὁ πρεσβυτερος, which is a title that he bore at Ephesus. But how will this objection stand, if John wrote the Apocalypse a considerable time before?—may he not only have adopted this custom, in those later times, to which the composition of his Epistles and Gospels is to be referred? How will it stand?—if John never published the Apocalypse, and if it was only found among his papers after his death:—may not the circumstance of John having mentioned his name in it have been one of the reasons of his allowing it to remain unpublished? and might he not, on this very account, latterly have adopted the custom of avoiding the mention of his name in all his writings?—It is very natural, that John should speak in his Gospel of his personal intercourse with Jesus, because he there details the history of his life from the commencement of his ministerial office to his Resurrection: also, in his first Epistle, he shews himself to have been personally conversant with Jesus, and to have been an Eye-witness of his actions, yet not as if it were his custom to boast of this honour. John only does this in the introduction to his first Epistle, and this introduction refers merely to his Gospel, which he wished thereby once more to render credible, as the account of an Eye-witness.

How then can it be reasonably argued from these two, that John ought also to have mentioned himself in the Apocalypse, as a Companion of Jesus, and as an immediate witness of his Discourses and Actions? For the Apocalypse is not a historical work, but is rather occupied with merely ideal subjects, which have no connection with the Biography of Jesus? It contains symbolical and prophetic descriptions, which John represents as revelations communicated to him by Jesus Christ;—would John, then, in it boast of any thing relative to his connection with Jesus Christ? Would it not rather be the first, the most natural, and most appropriate thing for him to boast of these revelations received from him?—It is admitted, that in the Gospel and first Epistle of John certain expressions, ideas, and terms so often occur, that they must be accounted favourite expressions and ideas of the writer: it must therefore be somewhat surprising, that in the Apocalypse, they are in some parts missing entirely, that in others they only occur in the most sparing degree. But, if this work had been composed about 20 or 30 years earlier than both, could not John in this long interval have appropriated to himself these peculiar ideas, have habituated himself to these particular expressions and terms? And must not we take into the account the difference of the subject, and the circumstance of John having but little originality in the Apocalypse, of his having copied a great number of

the passages in the Old Testament, and consequently spoken for the most part in the ideas and expressions of others?—Nor, can it be denied, that the Apocalypse not only differs considerably from John's Gospel and Epistles, by means of its far more frequent Hebraisms and Aramaisms, but also by means of its many violations of the Greek Grammar and Syntax: yet, if we have reason to believe the Apocalypse to have been considerably older than John's other writings, this objection may be just as easily invalidated, as the preceding. If, for instance, the question related to a Jewish writer born, brought up, and educated at Alexandria in Egypt, the great difference of style might fairly amount to an irrefutable argument, that the author of the Gospels and Epistles could not have been the author of the Apocalypse. For we might expect from such an one, that as to the principal elements his style must have been alike both in his earlier and later works. But the question relates to *a Galilæan*, a man of no polished education, an ἀνηρ ἰδιωτης και ἀγραμματος (as he is called in Acts iv. 13.) who spoke the Aramæan language, as long as he remained in Palestine, and at most only knew enough of the Greek, to be able to express himself in it, when compelled to do so, who not until he lived abroad among men, who spoke pure Greek, became better versed in its idiom, and probably then for the first time commenced his attempts at Greek composition, and only acquired very gra-

dually the facility of speaking and writing it with greater purity and correctness? Can it then be expected from such an one, without injustice and violence, that all his Greek writings should have the same quality of style? Every one will be just enough to admit, that in the sentence thus to be passed upon his writings, respect must be paid to their age. Now, if it may be proved, that John wrote his Apocalypse in the time of Nero or Galba, but his Gospel and Epistles not until a considerable time afterwards, can any proof be deduced from the faulty style of the Apocalypse, that it does not belong to the author of the Gospel and the Epistles? And is it not most perfectly and necessarily consonant to John's progress in Greek, that it should not be written in the purer and more correct style, which his Gospel and Epistles present, but that it should contain evidence of being the imperfect and faulty work of one, who also spoke and wrote Aramaic, and had just begun to practise Greek composition?

II. *According to the account of Epiphanius, those, whom he called the Alogi, founded their assertion, that the Apocalypse was falsely attributed to John, on the fourth Epistle* (ii. 18—29.) *being directed to the Church at Smyrna, in which city, at the time that John is said to have written the Apocalypse, there was no Christian Church. This objection against the authenticity of the Apocalypse, its more modern Antagonists*

have pronounced very weighty, because the Alogi dwelt in Thyatira and its neighbourhood, and therefore must have known, WHEN *a Christian Church was established in this city.*

On this conclusion the whole strength of the argument rests; but who will concede the *necessary consequence?* The Alogi at Thyatira might have been able to ascertain, when a Christian Church was established there; but the question is, did they rightly ascertain it? How many examples have we, in Ecclesiastical History, of the later inhabitants of a place erring in respect of the time and persons, when and by whom Christianity was introduced and naturalized among them! and what reason have we for making the Anti-Montanist Christians of Thyatira in the beginning of the third Century, better acquainted with the history of antiquity? It may be admitted, that the Christian Church *at that time* in Thyatira might have more certain data for retracing it to the time of its origin; and they may have been assured, that it did not exist till several years after the death of the Apostle John. On this, then, the Alogi founded their assertion, that this Apostle could not have written the Apocalypse. But they leave the question unexamined, whether a Christian Church did not indeed exist at Thyatira in the Apostolic age, which afterwards fell into decay? We have a great inducement to believe this to have been the case. According to the accounts of the Acts of the Apostles (xvi.

14. &c.) Paul converted Lydia at Philippi in Macedonia: she was a dealer in purple from Thyatira, and travelled with her family in her commercial capacity to different countries, returning in the intermediate times again to Thyatira her proper residence: all the members of her family were baptized together with her, and may it not be concluded from their readiness and liberality towards Paul and his assistants, that during some longer or permanent residence in their native city, they laboured to procure converts to the new doctrines among their relations, friends, and fellow-citizens? Have not many thousand local Christian Churches originated in this way? Lydia was a Jewish Proselytess (σεβομενη τὸν Θεον) and it may rationally be supposed, that other Proselytes were also resident in Thyatira. Christianity undeniably made its first and rapid progress in Asia Minor among these: how strongly thereby is the hypothesis corroborated, that this Lydia and her family were the original causes of Christianity being spread in the city of Thyatira shortly after the middle of the first Century, and of a Christian Church having been there in the times of Nero and Galba, when John, according to all probability, wrote his Apocalypse! It may only have been a small one, for we must not in general suppose most of the Christian Churches in the Apostolic age to have been an assembly of many thousands: and this may have been the cause, why after a short time it again fell into decay. Other causes, in-

deed, such as persecutions, may have contributed to it; for how many other examples does not History commemorate of the rapid rise of Christian Churches, and their subsequent disappearance in consequence of the calamities of the age! Such appears to have been the fate of the first Christian Community at Thyatira. Perhaps, a hundred years afterwards, a *new* Church arose in this city, after the memory of the first had long since been obliterated. Can we then wonder, that a part of the members of this second Church, which was partly inclined to the opinions of the Montanists, partly to those of the Alogi, asserted, that there had been no Christian Church in the city of Thyatira in the time of John the Apostle?

III. It has been alleged, that the *Apocalypse, in some passages, contradicts not only the Dogmatism of the Gospel and of the Epistles of John, but the Apostolical doctrines in general;* these objections, however, are such fallacious *deductions* from the Biblical passages, which are cited in their support, that we shall pass them by, and proceed to objection

IV. *The Author of the Apocalypse was indeed acquainted with the whole of the New Testament, and made use of it as he thought proper.* Cludius attempts to establish this by references to the other books. *e. g.* compare,

C. ii. 7. with Matt. xi. 15.
iii. 5. x. 32.
iii. 21. xxvi. 52.
xiii. 13., xix. 20. xxiv. 24.
xiv. 14. xiii. 41—43.
xviii. 24. xxiii. 37.
xix. 7. xxii. 2., xxv. 10.

iii. 5. with Luke ix. 26.
ix. 16. xxiii. 23.
xi. 2. xxi. 24.
xix. 9. xiv. 15.

vii. 14. with John xxi. 15.
ii. 28. viii. 28.
ix. 4. vi. 27.

i. 5. with the Acts. xxvi. 23.
ii. 14. 20. xv. 20.

i. 3. with Paul's Epist. Rom. xiii. 11.
ix. 20. Rom. i. 20.
iii. 17. 1 Cor. iv. 8.
x. 7. 1 Cor. xv. 51.
xx. 14. 1 Cor. xv. 54. 56.
xiv. 4. 2 Cor. xi. 2.
xvi. 15. 2 Cor. v. 3.
xxi. 5. 2 Cor. v. 17.
ix. 21. Gal. v. 19, 20.
xxii. 17. Eph. v. 27.
xxii. 15. Phil. iii. 2. cf. the whole passage with 1 Cor. vi. 10.
iii. 5. Phil. iv. 3.

C. v. 13.	with Phil. ii. 10.
iii. 3. xvi. 13.	1 Thess. v. 2, 3.
xxi. 8.	1 Tim. i. 9, 10.
xvii. 4.; xix. 16.	1 Tim. vi. 15., &c.
xxii. 21.	2 Tim. 4. 22.; Heb. xiii. 25.

With Peter and Jude

i. 6. v. 10.	1 Pet. ii. 5. 9.
ii. 14.	2 Pet. ii. 15, 16.; Jude ver. 11.
xxi. 1.	2 Pet. iii. 13.

He seems to have noticed the Epistle of James,—*e. g.*

xiv. 4	James i. 18.

and the Epistle of John,

xii. 17.	1 John v. 10.

The inference, which is attempted to be deduced from this collation of passages is, that, the author of the Apocalypse had the whole of the New Testament before him, consequently, that he could not have written it before the end of the first, or rather the beginning of the second Century.

If the premises be correct, the correctness of the inference also must be admitted; yet may we notwithstanding maintain, that John was

the Author of the Apocalypse. For, as it may be proved, that he lived nearly to the end of the first Century, so the Apocalypse might have been written in the last years of his life, after all the writings of the New Testament already lay before him. Both ancient and modern expositors have indeed deemed the composition of the Apocalypse to have been the Evangelist's last literary labour, and believed, that with this work he closed, and as it were sealed the Collection of the Books of the New Testament. But, the chief question is, are the premises of this conclusion correct? Now, if we accurately collate the passages here extracted from the Apocalypse, wherein the other Books of the New Testament are said to have been used, we shall be irresistibly convinced, that this conclusion has no solid ground, and rests on a mere fallacy.

Because Jesus (Matt. xi. 15.) says ὁ ἐχων ὠτα ἀκουειν, ἀκουετω, and because in the dedicatory Epistle to the Church at Ephesus and elsewhere, the words, ὁ ἐχων οὐς, ἀκουσατω τι τω Πνευμα λεγει, occur, the composer of the Apocalypse is affirmed to have made use of the Gospel of Matthew. But did not Jesus *very frequently* make use of that formulary of exhortation? and might it not have been known from oral tradition to the author of the Apocalypse, as a *very frequent* expression of Jesus? or are the words indeed so uncommon, that they could not of themselves have occurred to the author of the

Apocalypse? In the same manner, has he examined the fanciful analogy, which Cludius has endeavoured to establish from these passages, in which he has completely disproved the inference deduced from them; arguing, that if the same fallacious principle were extended, it might not only thus be demonstrated, that John made use of the other Books of the New Testament, but also that he made use of most of the Greek and Roman Classics.

V. At the time, when the Apocalypse was written, *the Martyrs must have been very much honored, if not adored, since, for the sake of raising their dignity, Jesus is represented as the first Martyr.* (i. 5.; iii. 14.) *It is said of them, that they stand before the throne of God and serve Him, day and night, that they suffer no more hunger nor thirst, nor heat, nor want, for the Lamb feeds them, and God wipes away all tears from their eyes.* (viii. 14—17.) How greatly from the very first, those Christians were respected, who amidst oppression and persecutions remained true to their convictions, the Epistles of the Apostles inform us, in which they are very frequently commended, and in what a high light those, who lost their lives for Christianity, were regarded, the example of Stephen certifies us. Hence the Apostles accounted the maintenance of the Faith under persecutions and sufferings as an indispensable criterion of a perfect Christian; which idea was afterwards greatly misunderstood, and misled

many to seek the Crown of Martyrdom. Consequently the Apocalypse in no one point of view represents any thing relative to this subject in a light contrary to that, in which it was accepted in the Apostolic age. For, all the writings of the New Testament represented Jesus Christ as the first sufferer, and all the Apostles taught, that those who suffered with Christ should also reign with him in the General Assembly of the Blessed.

VI. Before the Apocalypse was written, *the Christians must have experienced great persecutions, on account of the many Martyrs who are mentioned in it,* (vi. 9.; xvi. 6.; xx. 4.) *who cry for vengeance,* (vi. 9., &c.) *who have come out of great tribulation, and consecrated their garments in the Blood of the Lamb.* (vii. 14.) *It is said of religion personified in subsequent times, I saw the Woman drunk with the blood of the Saints and with the blood of the Witnesses of Jesus.* (xvii. 6.) If the Apocalypse had been a historical narrative, it might have been concluded from these passages, that at the time of its composition, very many Christian Martyrs must have already fallen. But it is merely a Prophetico-imaginative Description:—the Author foresaw, and had every reason to foresee, that through the fury of the Jews and Pagans, many Christians would be forced to seal their testimonies with their blood; the laws of poetical Licence allowed him to insert this foreseen

event, as a real line in his picture: who then will venture to explain or contradict from History this statement, which is to be considered merely as ideal, from the point of view at which the Author of the Apocalypse beheld it? There is nothing historical in it from beginning to end: the statement must be regarded as poetical, and in this light John could have indeed said the whole of this under Nero or Galba.

VII. *There is much in the Apocalypse, which is unworthy of an Apostle of Jesus, because it manifestly belongs to the popular superstition of the Jews, at that time:—e. g.* c. xiv. 18. an Angel is mentioned, as the Guardian of Fire, Water, &c.—It must first be proved, that John had entirely emancipated himself from the popular superstition of the Jews, when he wrote the Apocalypse. This, however, will be extremely difficult, because this Apostle, even in his Gospel, speaks of an Angel, who descended at certain periods into the Bath at Bethesda[o] (John v. 1., &c.)

VIII. *If John the Evangelist be the author of the Apocalypse, he could in no case have written*

[o] It will not follow from these passages, that John *believed* these popular ideas, or *wished them to be believed;* it is more probable, that they were mere allusions to the *popular* notions, which had become admixed with the phraseology of the age, and might pertinently be adduced in such a symbolical work, as the Apocalypse:—or their citation may be explained on the same principle, as Hug has explained those in the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude.

it before the time of Nero. But he was then certainly in his sixtieth year, at which age the fancy is no longer sufficiently strong and lively, to be able to sketch so vivid a picture, as the Apocalypse presents to us.

All that History has informed us respecting John, seems to intimate, that it was very late before he felt the effects of Age. The History of Literature moreover furnishes us with a multitude of examples, in which the poetical energy of the Genius has been but little or not at all lost in increasing years.

IX. *The Apocalypse is such a confused jumble of unnatural and grotesque images, of obscure symbols, extraordinary scenes, and singular phantoms, and is a mixture of ideas and descriptions borrowed from others, thrown together in such disorder, that we seem to detract from the credit of the Evangelist John, by harbouring the idea, that he was the author of this Book.*

However correct these remarks may be, they can only disprove the good taste and originality of John, and can have no connection with the solution of the question—DID JOHN THE EVANGELIST WRITE THE APOCALYPSE?

Such are Bertholdt's replies to the objections of Cludius more particularly:—in which many of the objections were too trifling to require a

refutation, and many of the refutations might have been rendered more forcible and argumentative. From hence, however, he proceeds to consider the *internal* arguments in favour of the authenticity of the Book.

I. Since the Apocalypse is a poetical work, which represents a general idea in images and symbols, the question can only rightfully be, whether these ideas, thus couched in figures and symbols, be conformable to the Genius of Christianity in general, and to the genius of St. John's other writings in particular? And this question must, without reservation, be answered affirmatively. That Christianity will be victorious over the irreligious and wicked World, over Judaism and Heathenism—is the idea which constitutes the soul of the Book, which makes it merely a Poetico-symbolical Commentary on the Parables of Jesus respecting the grain of mustard (Matt. xiii. 31., &c.) the leaven (Matt. xiii. 33., &c.), and that, which Jesus (John xii. 31.) says of the Judgment impending over the world.

II. The "*Christology*" of the Apocalypse is not merely perfectly conformable, in general, but in many individual characteristic definitions, to the "*Christology*" of John's Gospel. Bauer has indeed excited the suspicion, that the Apocalypse in this respect was only conformable to the Gospel of John, because the Author, who was a Christian Proselyte from Judaism, and had

been a learned Jew well versed in all the theories of the Judaico-Cabbalistical Theology, represents himself as John the Evangelist. But, although we would not deny the possibility of a person, by means of repeated, accurate, and intense study of the Gospel of John, becoming so well acquainted with the "*Christology*" of this Apostle, as to be able faithfully to imitate it, even to the minutest niceties, nevertheless conformities of another Description to the Gospel and Epistles of John moreover occur in the Apocalypse, to which the attempts and imitation of an Impostor have certainly never attained.

III. As far as the difference of subject and form of composition permits, such a conformity with respect to the style of expression in peculiar and figurative words, and with respect to the connexion of ideas, between the Apocalypse and the Gospel and Epistles of John, is remarked, as induces us to suppose the same Author to have written all of them. We should be obliged to pronounce the Apocalypse, at least half of it, as a master-piece or rather a miracle of literary fraud, if we were inclined with Bauer to account this coincidence, which generally descends even to minutiæ, merely as a happy imitation. For, the conformity goes still farther.

IV. Although the Gospel and Epistles of John were written at a much later time, and composed in incomparably better Greek, yet even in them

the language remarkably inclines to the Hebrew, particularly to the Aramæan idiom, whereby the Greek Diction becomes incorrect. But the greatest singularity is, that these errors are exactly of the same sort, as those in the Apocalypse, only more numerous and more gross. Would an impostor have possessed sufficient shrewdness and adroitness, to have produced this similarity? Besides, what object would he have had in multiplying these errors, which he had observed as something peculiar in the Gospel and Epistles of John, and in giving a still more incorrect style to the Apocalypse, which he had falsely attributed to John? To this question, as far as I can judge, no answer can be given. If the Impostor had been capable of detecting the errors of Greek idiom in the Gospel and Epistles of John, he must also have been capable of at least writing as good Greek, as that, in which these productions are written. For what purpose then would he have given to himself the unavailing trouble of investing the spurious work in a still more corrupt style? Could it have escaped his notice, that he would thereby be adopting the surest means of causing its spuriousness to be suspected? As in every thing else he is said to have proceeded with so much shrewdness and dexterity, for the purpose of concealing himself under the person of John the Evangelist, would he not here have acted in manifest contradiction to himself? But will not this matter on the other hand be perfectly explained, if we admit John to

have been the author of the Apocalypse, and to have written it, at an earlier period? When he wrote his Gospel and Epistles, he had habituated himself to a more correct Greek phraseology, yet not to one quite correct, so that, although he was not entirely free from his former errors, he was guilty of them less frequently and not so grossly.

V. In John's Gospel (xix. 37.) the passage from Zach. xii. 10. is thus expressed contrary to all the ancient versions, ὀψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκεντησαν, and we read almost in the same words in Apoc. i. 7. ὀψεται αὐτον πᾶς ὀφθαλμος, και οἵτινες αὐτον ἐξεκεντησαν. Can it be supposed, that the Impostor, who in many passages would have so badly supported his character, would have directed his attention to the style of John's Gospel even to this nicety, and in imitation of it have allowed to himself a variation from the Alexandrine version, which was commonly received among the Hellenists? Or must we not rather from this circumstance infer the identity of the author of the Apocalypse, and of our fourth Gospel?

If, then, from the preceding inquiries, we deduce a general result, it must be this: that WE HAVE A POSITIVE CERTAINTY, THAT JOHN THE EVANGELIST WROTE AN APOCALYPSE, AND THAT WE HAVE ALSO SUFFICIENT GROUND FOR RECOGNIZING IT IN THE BOOK, WHICH STANDS UNDER HIS NAME IN THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

We must now pursue the discussion with an epitomized Translation of the section, relative to the time and place, when and where the Apocalypse was composed. John relates (i. 9.) that he had received the visions, which he describes in the Apocalypse, in the island of Patmos, (now called Palmosa,) and although he does not expressly add, that he also noted them down in this island, we have, nevertheless, sufficient reason to believe it. For he was, at the same time, commanded to write in a Book the Visions, which had been communicated to him, and to send it to the Seven Churches of Asia Minor. Hence it follows, that John could not have written the Apocalypse in Asia Minor:—he must therefore have written it before his return from Patmos, consequently in Patmos itself, from whence he immediately repaired to the Continent of Asia Minor, without any intermediate residence in another place. The materials are certainly mere Fiction. John had not really the visions, and consequently did not receive the command to write them down, but he himself invented and devised them, and wrote them down of his own accord. This, however, makes no difference: John must have done it in some place or another, and as he names the island of Patmos, what reason have we for disbelieving him? Yet this allegation, that John saw these visions on the island of Patmos might be classed under the imaginative part, as Eichhorn has actually classed it. That it may be so classed no one can dispute; yet

the reasons which should make the admission of the contrary impossible, are not decisive. If (says Eichhorn) John's residence at Patmos be not assignable to poetic fiction, he will have delivered by the mixture of historical and non-historical circumstances, an anomalous work of fiction, which no critic possessing any taste can justify. But the assertion, that John was in the isle of Patmos, and there received the visions described in the book, is in no wise connected with these, nor is it even intermixed with them by one single stroke of the picture. The scene of the visions is not Patmos:—at one time it is Heaven, at another it is the space between Heaven and Earth, at another Judæa and Jerusalem, &c. Not a single circumstance in all occurs at Patmos, which is afterwards no more mentioned. Hence, it is most manifest, that the Poet himself separated from the poetic Fiction, the account, that he had received these visions, whilst he was in Patmos. It is merely the mention of the local point of view, whence the Author drew these symbolical pictures, and consequently must be considered to be historical. For John must have been somewhere, when he asserts himself to have received these visions, and is there any reason for supposing, that he should not have named this place? I know none, which compels us to deny this question. The ancient Hebrew Prophets generally say, where they were, when they received their visions, *e. g.* Ezekiel (i. 1.) says, that he was on the river Chabor.

Who, however, has dared to pronounce these declarations not historical? And if the Prophets were led to other places in their afflatus or *ecstases*, it is always mentioned by them: *e.g.* Ezek. viii. 1—3. Now since the author of the Apocalypse has almost too slavishly chosen for his patterns Ezekiel and all the other prophets who have described visions, would he not in this point have remained true to his Prototypes? would he not therefore have likewise said, that he came there, *not in reality, but in an ecstasis*, and saw his visions there? Would he not, instead of writing (i. 9, 10.) ἐγενομην ἐν τῇ νησῳ τῇ καλουμενῃ Πατμῳ, δια τον λογον τοῦ Θεοῦ, και δια την μαρτυριαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἐγενομην ἐν πνευματι, και ἠκουσα ὀπισω μου φωνην μεγαλην, have rather written, ἐγενομην ἐν πνευματι ἐν τῇ νησῳ τῇ καλουμενῃ Πατμῳ, δια τον λογον τοῦ Θεοῦ, και δια την μαρτυριαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, και ἠκουσα ὀπισω μου φωνην μεγαλην? This we might justly expect, if the residence at Patmos was merely to be regarded as a fiction; but the clause δια τον λογον τοῦ Θεοῦ, και την μαρτυριαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ proves, that John wished to be historically understood. It has, however, been doubted, whether beyond these assertions in the Apocalypse there was any authority for John having ever been at Patmos. Tertullian, [p] indeed, affirms it, in whose time it must have been a generally extended tradition; Clemens Alexandrinus [q] speaks of it, *as of a fact well known*, and

[p] De Præscript Hær. § 36. So also Irenæus said according to the Chronicon of Eusebius.

[q] Apud. Eus. H. E. iii. 23.

some time afterwards Origen appeals to THE ANCIENT TRADITION in his communication of the same account. This tradition could not have been simply derived from the Apocalypse, because it must have been known in the first Century, whether John was ever in that island, and he was a personage of too much importance, for the attention of the Church not to have been directed towards him, consequently we cannot reconcile to ourselves the existence of this tradition, without supposing it to have been founded on fact. If we are not to judge of this assertion (i. 9, 10.) as a historical truth, how can we account for his cotemporaries and successors having maintained, that he actually was in Patmos? and would not this obvious fiction, so gravely detailed as a history, have raised doubts against the authenticity of the Book? and would not its opponents in the third Century, who sought every means of assailing it from ANCIENT TRADITION, have adduced this formidable objection against it? We must therefore decide it to have been a historical truth, that John really lived for some time at Patmos, and there wrote the Apocalypse.

Several reasons have been assigned for his arrival in this island. We cannot conjecture it to have been *voluntary*, for the purpose of spreading the doctrines of Christianity there: for it was merely an inhospitable rock, never inhabited by more than a few hundred people living

in the most abject poverty. The words, δια τον λογον του Θεου, και δια την μαρτυριαν Ιησου Χριστου, (i. 9.) cannot therefore imply, *for the purpose of spreading the Divine Doctrines of Jesus Christ.* Consequently, it will also follow from hence, that his residence there could not have been *accidental,*—from his having landed in the island, remained and taught the Gospel there, in consequence of having been driven there (on a voyage probably from Ephesus, or from another place to Ephesus) by a storm, or some particular business, which the ship, in which he was, had at Patmos. Of this we are certified by i. 9., εγω Ιωαννης, ὁ και αδελφος υμων, και συγκοινωνος εν τῃ θλιψει. Something disagreeable must have therefore occurred to him, which was connected with his stay in this place. We now easily perceive, what must be the meaning of δια τον λογον του Θεου, και δια την μαρτυριαν Ιησου Χριστου. They shew why he was εν θλιψει, and why he resided on the desert island of Patmos. He however calls himself συγκοινωνος εν τῃ θλιψει; consequently, the Christians in Asia Minor must have been, at that time, in a disturbed state. Those at Smyrna were exposed to the danger of being cast into prison. (ii. 10.) At Pergamus, they had already been exposed to severe persecutions; one of them had already suffered martyrdom, and the others still remained faithful to the Gospel (ii. 13.) On the other hand, at Sardis some of the Christians had been induced to apostatize by fear (iii. 4, 5.) Thus, a general distress

then prevailed among the Christians of Asia Minor, during which John was banished to Patmos[r], as a punishment for having preached the doctrines of Christianity. This assertion of the ancient Ecclesiastical historians being therefore fully corroborated by the Book itself, should we not be guilty of Hyperscepticism, if we disbelieved it?

The most ancient Fathers as well as modern Scholars differ, notwithstanding, respecting the time, when he was banished to Patmos, and wrote the Apocalypse. Dorotheus, who is said to have been Bishop of Tyre in the fourth Century, and to have written a Biography of the Prophets, Apostles, and Disciples of our Lord, fixes John's Banishment to Patmos in the time of Trajan, and according to another MS. of his Book, in the time of Adrian. But, Irenæus, and probably Tertullian also, Victorinus of Petavia, Jerome, Sulpitius Severus, and many more, refer it to the reign of Domitian. This opinion must have been the most commonly received, because Eusebius several times makes mention of it. Yet according to the subscription of the Syriac Apocalypse, edited by Ludovicus De Dieu, it took place during the reign of Nero, and according to Epiphanius, during that of Claudius.

[r] A tradition is preserved in connection with this by Tertullian de Præs. Hær. § 36. "habes Romam, ubi Apostolus Johannes, postquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in Insulam relegatur." Also by Eusebius in his Chronicon on the 14th year of Domitian, Ἰωαννὴν τον Θεολογον Ἀποστολον ἐν Πατμῳ τῇ νησῳ περιωρεσεν· ἐνθα τὴν Ἀποκαλυψιν ἑωρακεν, ὡς ὁ ἁγιος Εἰρηναῖος φησι.

But we can argue nothing against *the fact* from this uncertainty respecting the time, because the tradition, which mentions the Apostle's banishment, neither declares *the time*, when it happened, nor *the Emperor*, who commanded it. This was the case in Egypt.—Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen notice it as a most positive fact, but record neither the time nor the Emperor, and they certainly would not have passed over these in silence, if the ancient tradition of the Egyptian Church had commemorated any particulars of it. In other Countries this tradition was deemed too bare, and attempts were made to clothe it. Thus each naturally proceeded from his own conjectures, and as these were variously and in general not most accurately founded, hence arose the vastly different opinions with which we meet. To comprehend, how the Banishment of John can be placed under the reign of Trajan or even of Adrian, and how the composition of the Apocalypse also can be placed in the latter part of the Evangelist's life, we should bear in mind, that many of the ancients believed the Apocalypse to have been his last work, with which he closed and as it were sealed, in his extreme old age, the collection of the Christian Revelations. Eichhorn ingeniously explains the idea of John's Banishment being referred to the reign of Domitian, from it being known, that he was released at the succession of a new Emperor. Consequently, a period in the history of the reigns of the Cæsars was sought,

in which Banishments occurred, from which a subsequent fortunate period granted a release? Now, as History mentions such Banishments by Domitian, and at the same time records, that after his death the Roman Senate rescinded the order of Banishment, and allowed each exile to return to his Dwelling-place, they had no hesitation in fixing John's Banishment to Patmos in the reign of Domitian. The assertion, that John was exiled to the desert Isle of Patmos under the Emperor Nero, seems not merely to have been occasioned by the Persecutions, which this Tyrant impended over the Christians, but rather to have proceeded from the exegetical expositions of some passages in the Apocalypse, to which we shall hereafter return. We cannot so easily guess what induced Epiphanius to place the Banishment of John under the reign of Claudius Cæsar. This opinion seems to be entirely peculiar to him: yet he delivers it in connection with such circumstances, as exhibit it as a great chronological error, and on that account exclude the hypothesis, that Epiphanius derived it from any ancient tradition. For, Epiphanius says, that at his return, which likewise took place under Claudius, John was ninety years old. He did not in his historical ignorance perceive the contradiction, which by means of this assertion he was making to himself, and probably allowed himself to be thus misled by the opinion maintained by other ancient Writers, that John was banished from Rome to Patmos, and by the

conjecture, that the expulsion of the Jews from Rome which was commanded by Claudius, also extended to the Christians established there.

Thus have we endeavoured to ascertain the occasions and reasons of the different opinions maintained by the ancient Ecclesiastical Historians respecting the time of John the Evangelist's Banishment to the isle of Patmos, and respecting the time of the Composition of the Apocalypse. But in modern times other Decisions discrepant from these have been given. Eichhorn most confidently asserts, that the Apocalypse was composed in one of the years immediately after the Destruction of Jerusalem, consequently in the reign of Vespasian, between the years of our Lord 71—78. He says, that the Apocalypse presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem to have already taken place, otherwise John could not have conceived the notion of representing the decline of Judaism under the figure of the Destruction of the Jewish state. A great part also of his metaphors is taken from the Destruction of Jerusalem; when the Apocalypse was written (C. xvii. 9.) five Cæsars were already dead (Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero), a sixth was on the throne, who could be no other than Vespasian, because Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, who could not maintain themselves against him, cannot well be admitted into the series of the Cæsars. John could

only from the commencement of the Jewish war have found occasion to exhibit the fall of Judaism under the metaphor of the Destruction of the Jewish state: he indeed made use of figures and representations, which were taken from a destroyed city; but not one representation, not one trait of his picture agrees with that, which really took place at the Destruction of Jerusalem; the passage in C. xvii. 9. presupposes the death of Nero, only in case we begin to reckon from Augustus; we may, however, also begin from Julius Cæsar. Yet, if it be necessary to commence the series of Cæsars with Augustus, wherefore must we pass over Galba, Otho, and Vitellius? Although they could not long maintain themselves upon the throne, they were, nevertheless, some time in possession of it, and were on that account included by all Historians in the series of Roman Emperors.

That opinion, which places the Composition of the Apocalypse after the Destruction of Jerusalem, or after the year of our Lord 70, must be absolutely rejected. Vogel very strikingly remarks, that the eleventh chapter would have had a totally different meaning, than it now has, if Jerusalem had been destroyed, and if the events, which there took place, had been known to John. Many assertions, metaphors, and scenes in the Apocalypse presuppose indeed the continuance, as yet, of the Levitical Services, and of the whole Jewish Constitution.

Consequently, the Apocalypse must have been written before the Destruction of Jerusalem, or before the year of our Lord 70: which is evident from the comparative relation of its Diction to that in the Gospel and Epistles. The difference is so great in many other characteristic similarities, which assure us of the identity of the writer, that the Apocalypse must have been written several years before the Gospel and Epistles. Hence, indeed, the notion of Epiphanius, that it was written in the reign of Claudius, consequently A.D. 41—54, obtains some probability, and Storr has actually attached great weight to it. Yet many objections may be urged against it. Though we read of no persecution of the Christians in the reign of Claudius, yet the Jews, who never omitted an opportunity of harassing the Christians, may have doubtless had sufficient influence with the Roman Court or the Governors of Provinces, to have caused a decree of exile to have been issued against John, as one of the main pillars of the new Doctrines. But, that John was banished under Claudius is contrary to History. In his time, the Seven Churches, to which the Apocalypse is dedicated, were not so numerous nor so perfectly organized, as to have had each of them its own Bishop (Ἀγγελον τῆς Ἐκκλησιας), especially, as about the time that Claudius died, (A. 54.,) Paul had only just baptized the first Christians, (12 in number, Acts xix. 1—7.) at Ephesus, and from this period, during his more than two years' residence in this city (10) the

Ephesian community first began to be formed, but its perfect organization was not until afterwards effected by Timothy (who had received that commission from Paul) after Paul was forced to leave Ephesus (ver. 23. xx. 1.)

Consequently it could not have been written before the reign of Nero; and since it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, its composition must either fall during Nero's reign, or during that short interval, when after Nero's death, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, one after another, directed the helm of government and sat on the throne. In proportion, as the first hypothesis has fewer external arguments in its favor, it has the stronger internal, nor are these in any wise to be contemned. The subscription of the Syriac version of the Apocalypse is certainly founded on an old tradition; for at a much earlier period the idea was prevalent, that the Apocalypse was written before the Destruction of Jerusalem, and during the life-time of the Apostle Paul. But it is impossible, that they, who entertained this opinion, should have retraced it to the reign of Claudius; for, they must have believed, that it was composed in the following reign of Nero. The most ancient trace of this hypothesis is found in the well known fragment in Muratori, which is derived from the second or the beginning of the third Century. In the sixth Century we find another testimony in a commentary

written by Arethas on the Apocalypse, with merely this difference, that it fixes its composition before the dissolution of the Jewish state, and the destruction of Jerusalem. Most probably this more modern testimony is connected with the former ancient Tradition: for we have considerable reason to suppose, that Arethas here, as in other things, followed the more ancient expositors of the Apocalypse. The reign of Nero seems peculiarly adapted to maintain the credibility, that John was banished to Patmos, because he exceedingly oppressed the Christians. As Pliny's letters to Trajan and other Authorities assure us, the Governors of Provinces frequently acted against *individual* Christians, without command from the Court; consequently, though Nero may have issued no general law against the Christians, the Proconsul of Asia, hearing how the Emperor was proceeding against them at Rome, or acting under Jewish influence, may have banished the Evangelist John to Patmos. There are, moreover, some obscure traces in History, not only of John being in Ephesus during the persecution of Nero, but of his having made at this period a sea-voyage, during which he experienced a disaster[s]. Besides, John's return from Patmos seems in another older writing[t] to be placed in

[s] Martyrium Timothei in Photii Biblioth. Ed. Aug. Vindel. 1601. p. 762.

[t] Chronicon Alexandrinum curâ et studio Car. du Fresne. Venet. 1729. Fol. p. 197.

the first year of Vespasian's reign, whence it naturally follows, that he was banished there during Nero's reign. But that which gives the preponderance of authority to the opinion, that John was banished to this island in the time of Nero, is, that the Apocalypse itself most decidedly fixes its composition in the reign of this Emperor. The ἀλλο θηριον ἀναβαινον ἐκ τῆς γῆς (xiii.11.) is manifestly a Governor of the Roman Empire, who is symbolized under the θηριον ἐκ τῆς θαλασσης ἀναβαινον, ἐχον κεφαλας ἑπτα και κερατα δεκα, και ἐπι τῶν κερατῶν αὐτοῦ δεκα διαδηματα, και ἐπι τας κεφαλας αὐτοῦ ὀνοματα βλασφημιας. (ver. 1.) The former θηριον ἀναβαινον ἐκ τῆς γῆς is however more closely designated by the mystical number χξς (666) which is ἀριθμος ἀνθρωπου.

The only correct solution is that of the name Λατεινος, which Nero bore as a cognomen. The Author of the Apocalypse, however, does not degrade himself respecting the time of this θηριον ἀναβαινον ἐκ τῆς γῆς, i. e. respecting Nero's reign: for in another vision (xvii. 3.) the Roman Empire again appears under the Symbol of a Beast, and is in general so designated: θηριον κοκκινον, γεμον ὀνοματων βλασφημιας, ἐχον κεφαλας ἑπτα και κερατα δεκα. It is said at the ninth and tenth verses, that the seven Heads denote, besides the seven Hills (on which Rome is built) seven Emperors (βασιλεις) also: οἱ πεντε ἐπεσαν, *five are already dead,* και ὁ εἱς ἐστιν, *and one (the sixth) still lives,* ὁ ἀλλος οὐπω ἠλθε, και ὁταν ἐλθῃ ὀλιγον αὐτον

δεῖ μεῖναι, *the other (the seventh) is not yet come; and when he is come, he will not remain long* Here John manifestly says, that he was writing in the time of the sixth Roman Emperor; there appears therefore no further difficulty in determining the age of the Apocalypse. But it is not agreed, from whom we should begin. The Generality believe, that we should begin from Augustus Cæsar, because he was the proper Constructor of the Roman Empire. According to this calculation, if with Eichhorn and others we immediately pass over from Nero to Vespasian, the Author of the Apocalypse would have placed himself in the reign of the last-mentioned Emperor; but it is merely arbitrary conduct, and not to be justified, to pass over Galba and his two Successors on the Throne. If we follow this mode of calculation, Galba must therefore be justly reckoned, as the sixth Emperor, and the composition of the Apocalypse must be referred to his short reign. (A.D. 68.) Yet I conceive, that I have preponderating reasons for commencing the computation of the seven Emperors with Julius Cæsar. That we should place him in the series of Roman Regents, cannot be the subject of a doubt. He was the Individual, who dismembered the Republican Constitution, and established the Monarchical Government: for Augustus only seated himself in the nest, which Julius Cæsar had prepared. A necessity also appears to me to be contained in the 17th and 18th chapters of the Apocalypse, which are

most closely connected with each other, for beginning the calculation with Julius Cæsar. The Θηριον κοκκινον (xvii. 3.), and the Θηριον ἐκ τῆς θαλασσης ἀναβαινον (xiii. 1.), are indisputably one and the same Symbol: both denote the Roman Empire, as the source and seat of Paganism. Both have seven Heads, which denote the seven first Emperors. Now, John says (xiii. 3.), και εἰδον μιαν τῶν κεφαλων αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐσφαγμενην εἰς θανατον, και ἡ πληγη τοῦ θανατου αὐτοῦ ἐθεραπευθη, και ἐθαυμασθη ἐν ὁλῃ τῇ γῇ, ὀπισω τοῦ Θηριου. These words admit no natural and appropriate exposition, but by referring them to the death of Julius Cæsar: here μιαν stands for πρωτην, (as in ix. 12. John xx. 19.) "*I saw the first of the Heads slain, but the mortal wound of the Beast was again healed.*" Julius Cæsar had founded the Monarchy (or Empire):—by his death it appeared to be again annihilated; this however was not the case, for to the astonishment of all the World, it revived in Augustus. If then we commence our computation from Julius Cæsar, Nero is the sixth Emperor, under whose reign, consequently, the Apocalypse must have been written.

Probably, John was banished to Patmos from Ephesus (where he could not have established himself before the year 60 or 61) in the year 64, when Nero was raging against the Christian Inhabitants of Rome, by the Proconsul of Asia Minor, either in consequence of a General Imperial Mandate, which had been issued, or by his own

arbitrary power, whilst the Christian Churches in Asia Minor were at the same time in various ways oppressed by him. During his exile, the Jewish war broke out (in the year 66) the account of which arrived to him in this island. Meditating on the probable consequences of this war, he must necessarily have foreseen its influence on the Christian cause, and been excited to joyful expectations. Hence he resolved to write the Apocalypse. His inactive life afforded to him the leisure necessary for the purpose; for it is an ancient falsehood, that John was obliged to work in the mines at Patmos.

Having made such copious extracts from Bertholdt, on this subject, which were indeed necessary in consequence of the ancient and modern controversies respecting the authenticity of the Book, we must pass by his examination of Vogel's theory respecting its three distinct parts, and the different times in which he conjectures them to have been written, and conclude this

Bertholdt's remarks on the Books of both Testaments are individually conducted with the same acumen and research, as in this examination of the Apocalypse: the whole of his work on the Old Testament, and the matter omitted in this Preface on the New will be translated in the MUSEUM THEOLOGICUM, which will make its appearance at the end of the year. This projected series of Theological Treatises will comprize the greater part of the Biblical researches of the Continental Scholars, including their Latin Essays, and translations of unpublished Oriental Documents relative to Ecclesiastical History. For other particulars, however, omitted in this Preface, the reader is referred to the Rev. Hartwell Horne's valuable Introduction to the Scriptures, which will supply many of the illustrations required by the present work.

epitome with his observations on the original language of the Apocalypse. Some, from the inelegance and incorrectness of its Greek, have supposed it to have been originally composed in Hebrew, and the incorrectness to be attributable to its unknown Translator. Michaelis quotes some passages, which may be adduced in support of this notion. In C. ix. 16., the two readings δυο μυριαδες μυριαδων and μυριαδες μυριαδων occur, these however seem not to have been different readings, but merely different Translations of a Hebrew text. If רבותים stood in the Hebrew, the one Translator may have rendered it μυριαδες μυριαδων, and the other accepting it in the dual, δυο μυριαδες μυριαδων. In C. x. 11. several MSS. read for και λεγει μοι,—καλεγουσι μοι: ואמר לי may denote both, being in modern Hebrew frequently and strangely used as an Impersonal; thus, the one Translator may have understood it in the one way and the other in the other. But this confluence of translations into our present text would, if admitted, involve us in fresh and vast difficulties. The Hebrew being at that period only the language of the Priests and the Learned, John, from his style of education, most probably was unable to write a Book in it, since those of his order in society only understood the Aramæan: hence, if our present Greek text of the Apocalypse be not the original, we might with greater propriety assume with Bolten, that John wrote it in Aramaic. Bolten himself admits, that he discovers in it no peculiar errors of translation, yet he conceives its

numerous and harsh Aramaisms to be sufficient authorities for his opinion. He even deduces a proof of this, from ch. xiii. 18.; because he discovers Titus's full name, TITUS FLAVIUS VESPASIANUS written in Syriac characters to be equivalent to the mystical number 666. No one, however, will grant this to be correspondent to the context and tenor of the Apocalypse; and its numerous Aramaisms will only serve to shew, that John, at the time of writing the Apocalypse, was still so strongly imbued with his native tongue, as to have very frequently and forcibly bent his Greek idiom to it.

Of all the theories, which Bertholdt's work contains, that of the almost unlimited reference of the several Books to an Aramæan original is perhaps the most preposterous. There are forcible reasons for admitting the truth of this conjecture in the Gospel of Matthew, and the Epistle to the Hebrews; but with respect to the other Books of the New Testament, it appears to have been most gratuitously assumed. No such argument may be deduced from the Hebraisms or Aramaisms, which occur in them, because the native idiom and previous education of the writers would naturally occasion them in any foreign language, in which they might write their works. For many of the phrases and peculiar expressions, which have been noticed in these writings, were common to the Language of the age, as Lightfoot, Schœttgen, and

others have proved by innumerable examples; many were also common to the neighbouring Countries, and are found to be still existing in those regions of the East, and several, (if not the majority) may be discoverable in the Targumin, the Talmudin, and the Rabbinical pages. Consequently, this fact will fully account for their influence on the Greek of the New Testament, without the supposition of an Aramæan original. In every instance, indeed, which has been cited in support of this hypothesis, the Aramæan terms have been *conjectured*:—the whole argument has been therefore constructed on *this conjecture*, and the inference has been drawn from it without any vestige of an authentic foundation. These conjectural readings may be useful, as *probable* Exegeses of the text, but they can never prove its vitiation, nor demonstrate, that it is but a mere Translation. In several of these conjectural criticisms Bolten has also distorted words from their natural and obvious signification, and proposed others, which could not have been so used by the Apostles, even if they existed in the Apostolic age, and out of the vast number, which he has offered, there are but very few which are worthy of regard, *even as conjectures*, from the unsupported manner, in which they have been proposed, and the unbridled fancy, from which they have emanated.

We may moreover argue the question relative to Aramæan originals from our own ex-

perience, in the same manner as we have examined Hug's assertion of the universal prevalence of the Greek in Palestine. Let us suppose a person conversant in a foreign Language in a similar ratio to the Apostle's knowledge of Greek:—would not a native detect both in this idiom and occasionally even in his Grammar distinctive traces of the vernacular Language of the Speaker? would not these also be equally discernible in his composition? Let us suppose an Englishman or a German speaking and writing French, which may be analogous to St. Paul as a Jewish native of Tarsus speaking Greek,—would he ever arrive at such a perfection in the niceties of French idiom, that a Frenchman should be unable to notice any impurities of style, any deficiencies in elegance or the finer turns of expression? would he in fact ever be able to speak and write the Language, as well as a highly educated Native? But, is not the case precisely the same with respect to the classic Greek and the barbarous Greek of the New Testament? and is not the difference sufficiently explained, without resorting to the hypothesis of vernacular Originals? Is it not *the mere and natural effect* of writing in a foreign Tongue? Do we, for instance, suppose Philo Judæus and Josephus to have written some Semitic original, from which their present works are *mere translations?* Yet, who will affirm, that their style is as pure, as that of the classical productions of ancient Greece? Do we not also perceive

from the Jews resident in every nation of Europe, that they cannot so far disengage themselves from the trammels of their sacred Tongue, as to be able to speak the Language of the Countries, where they are born, like the rest of the natives? and can we expect the Apostles to have formed exceptions to this universal observation?

Equally fanciful is his idea, that the name of the supposed Translator of the Epistles may be inferred from those mentioned by Paul in the introductory verses; for they may merely have been named as the persons, who were then in his society, or as coinciding with him in the contents of the respective Epistles, to which their names were prefixed. There are also many other manifestly unsupported assumptions in his Book, which neither the space nor the nature of a Preface would allow us to discuss, but on the other hand, there is a vast body of luminous Criticism, of historical research, and all-various learning, which has been unavoidably omitted for the same reason.

I may now be allowed to state my inducement to epitomize another work on the same subject in the Preface, instead of drawing the reader's attention to the merits and failures of Hug. It had been my original intention to have illustrated and examined each separate section,

to have submitted every assertion to the test [z], and to have supplied many deficiencies, in pursuance of which design I delayed the Translation for the purpose of collecting materials from other Authors who had not been translated, in the hopes, that the matter of all the best Writers on the New Testament might be embodied in this work. But, whilst I was devoting myself to this task, I was informed, that another Gentleman was likewise employed in the same research, and had greatly preceded me in it: consequently, I immediately abandoned my plan, and applied myself with all possible rapidity to the mere Translation, that I might redeem the time, which I had thus so unfortunately lost. When the greater part of the Book had however proceeded through the press, I was certified, that this Gentleman had also relinquished his intention; nothing, therefore, remained to me, but to supply the want of Illustrations by the Epitome of another Work in the Preface, and to add a few critical notes to that part, which was not printed at the time of my receiving this positive information, which will account for the latter part containing so many more Annotations than the former.

[z] Several of his assertions clearly require a close inspection, and should be retraced to the authorities, on which he affirms himself to have founded them: *e. g.* his assertion respecting the Alogi in p. 643. vol. ii. is directly contradicted by the authority, which I have produced in the note on the preceding page.

AN

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

PART I.

ON THE AGE AND AUTHENTICITY OF THESE WRITINGS.

SECTION I.

THE greater nations, with which we are acquainted, had, or still have, positive systems of religion, which probably were merely furnished with particular precepts relative to a peaceful intercourse with the Gods, by means of offerings, gifts, and other enactments of worship, or subsequently in well established states, with precepts relative to those virtues, which adorn communities and individuals. This will also appear to be the case, even in subsequent epochs, provided we be not desirous of drawing men, by means of uncertain information, towards a goal which they did not entirely attain; for it is an idle idea to expect in the dark ages of nations, bright philosophers and Socratic societies [a].

The labour of life, which is for the most part

[a] Plato de Repub. L. vi. p. 89. indulged this opinion: φιλοσοφον το πληθος ἀδυνατον εἰναι.

allotted to our species, will never cease to demand that time, which such views and convictions require; what then guided us in the interim, until every one was furnished with his wisdom? or what was left to him, who probably did not overtake his wiser brother? what to younger generations of mankind, which as yet had not attained maturity of moral conduct? It is replied, the authority of fathers and fellow-citizens. What! this authority! —if so, it must constantly happen, that an authority more certain, more general, more in unison with itself, and more sacred gives birth to it, which directs its principal aim to the morals and precepts of fathers and fellow-citizens!

The duties of the citizen's life are not more difficult to understand, than those of men of unsophistical morals; yet we for ever abandon the hope of seeing people, who, without positive laws, by their own intuition derive civic obligations from their principles and fulfil them. If then the system of national legislation be positive, their moral system must be the same: both therefore are equally calculated to direct men and their occupations.

But the ancients made no such accurate distinctions: the time was not arrived for distinguishing law from virtue. It greatly contributed to the first step towards it, that men had discovered the former, and were unanimous concerning it, but the latter still remained without definitions the portion of rare and great souls. They were contented in this particular to hallow the laws from reverence to the Gods, and religion continued to flow with the current of the ordinances of society in a civic condition.

He who at first isolated man, separating him from his place, nation, and country, as well as from the influence of foreign requisitions, was in the way of

violent changes, and is beneficent without such terrible phenomena as tempest and earthquake, but with such as the alternation of the seasons, which are either milder or severer, according to the changes of the world, on which they depend.

The first universal religion was developed by Judaism: it was furnished with Monotheism, as its fundamental doctrine, and with many other opinions proceeding from it. He who first comprehended so enlarged a view, who embraced in his mind the idea of an universal religion, and realized it, was Jesus of Nazareth. If indeed a mere mortal, if the son of Sophroniscus had received a true glance of it, yet he perished in promulgating it among a people, who for their civilization and appreciation of the beautiful and the true by far excelled every other. Jesus, however, adopted those fundamental principles, which existed in the mind of his nation, he removed all that had a local, civil, and national relation, he extracted from them that which was purely moral, he ennobled religion, advanced it to its true dignity, and gave to it its completion, by the restitution of all that had been wanting to it.

He indeed bestowed again upon it the rank of positive ordinances from the Supreme Being, by whom he had been sent: but he emancipated it from the influence of constraint and political occurrences, and proposed it to universal belief and understanding, so that all men, each according to his faculty, might have a part in it, exert and unfold all their talents in promoting it, and embellish it by a continual progress.

Wherefore, to assist the weak, every duty is divided into commandments, that no one might be impeded from seeking its basis in the whole creation, and from uniting it with the several parts

hopes of a more excellent condition, for the offering of a virtuous and well-enduring present time.

Thus, Jesus of Nazareth raised the Mosaic constitution to the rank of a religion, which has become among many events and reverses our guide and conductor, which alone has a distinguished fame above all other religions, being the instructress, or certainly the directress of the most polished and cultivated nations of the globe. He, therefore, who is inclined to detract from it has not extended his survey to the whole, or takes into the account human follies which it could not pass over in silence. But he, who is of opinion that he can now go by himself, and stands no longer in need of this support, is not one with whom we have either space or leisure to contend :— yet such an one rejects it not with supercilious self-ignorance, but deposits it with thankful reverence before its altars. Who having deposited his staff in the temple at Epidaurus, and proceeded thence without it, can deride the beneficent Deity! Or is not the hand of the mother which taught us to walk, worthy of all honour!

We must not in this place adduce that which Jesus on another occasion disclosed to his disciples, respecting certain mysterious doctrines, for the sake of publicly exhibiting the value of his religion in this particular, since the different schools which call themselves by his name, are not unanimous concerning them. Otherwise we shall be obliged to commence our researches with a controversy, which can only be begun at the point where *they* end.

The preliminary remarks from which we have started, may be useful to us in forming a judgment of the utility of his instructions for the general necessities of mankind, and of the importance which

may be attached to the investigations, which we devote to the books in which they are contained.

SECTION II.

Jesus of Nazareth made his appearance under Tiberius as an instructor in Judea, where he was condemned to death by Pontius Pilate the Roman Procurator: yet this circumstance did not impede his disciples from extending themselves not only in this country, but still further in the Roman dominions, and even in the metropolis itself.

The synopsis of his life and doctrines most worthy of our attention is contained in the writings of the Christians, who, as their name imports, were among his first disciples; *i. e.* in five historical books, the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and the Acts of the Apostles, who employed themselves after his death in propagating his doctrines and school,—next in certain didactic writers, *i. e.* fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul and in seven Epistles of the other Apostles. The fourteen Epistles of Paul are addressed to the following communities of the followers of Jesus:—one to that at Rome, two to that at Corinth, one to that at Galatia, one to that at Ephesus, one to that at Philippi, one to that at Colosse, two to that at Thessalonica, two to his assistant Timothy, one to Titus, one to Philemon, one to the Hebrews. As to the seven Epistles of the other Apostles, James is the author of one, Peter of two, John of three, Jude of one. The apocalypse which closes this collection forms a class of itself, being accounted prophetical.

SECTION III.

ARE THE ORIGIN AND DATE JUST STATED RIGHTLY ADJUDGED TO THESE WRITINGS? OR, HAVE THEY ACQUIRED THIS CHARACTER MERELY BY SURREPTITIOUS MEANS? This is, naturally, the first question on which all subsequent inquiries must depend; if it be not satisfactorily answered, all our preceding remarks concerning the doctrines and designs of Jesus, will be not only badly founded, but it will indeed be very difficult to discover any thing certain as to his peculiar doctrinal opinions, and the object of this Philosopher.

We may, in two ways, inform ourselves concerning the authenticity or spuriousness of these writings, viz. *from their internal evidences, or from the accounts of writers*, who have made mention of them in ancient times, and therefore have attested their existence, or known the authors to whom they belong.

We first speak of the HISTORICAL BOOKS of the New Testament, in relation to the internal proofs of their authenticity.

Should any one, without knowing any thing further of them, any where, unexpectedly find them (which is an argument that a [b] recent writer has rendered very probable), and being thus furnished with them, open them with the necessary scrutiny, what opinion would such a man form of their origin, age, and composers, solely from their internal state?

He would say that they were written in Greek, yet in none of the proper dialects of that language, but with a variation of expression and construction,

[b] Gottfried Less, concerning religion, its history, and proofs, v. I. p. 2. §. 28.

which is frequently so strikingly approximated to the Hebrew, in the use of words and in grammatical connexion, that one would account the authors to have been Jews, who spoke the Greek language. They contain, also, so little of science and the historic art, that they manifestly are the essays of uneducated men, who, with the exception of a certain acquaintance with the Jewish writings, lay no pretensions to information and literature. The narration itself is so constituted, that it represents them, notwithstanding its brevity, as having the mien and demeanour of persons engaged in traffic; it depicts their situation and motion from place to place, the parts which the spectators bore, their expressions, their actions, and appearance. Thus must any one say who, without the aid of other preceding accounts, would pass a judgment on these books, merely from their internal arrangement.

And this is precisely what the Christians say of them, viz. that they were written by native Jews, all of whom were of plebeian origin and rank, without any literary education, who were either, as eye-witnesses, or by means of eye-witnesses, informed of the events which they have described.

We may also conclude, that the biographies of illustrious men every where express more or less a perfect description of their age and country, of their municipal regulations, their manners and the other circumstances, under which they appeared, with which their life was surrounded, and their undertakings connected. According as our acquaintance with all these peculiarities and circumstances, and with the entire picture of the time be more or less accurate, are we enabled to remark whether the writer had seen those days which form the subject of his history, or how far he was removed from them: this appears the

more striking in proportion as the detail in such a biography is greater, or the occupations in which the individual was concerned more numerous and elaborate, which is the province of history.

To this object the labours of those learned men, in particular, conduct us, who have paid attention to the political regulations of the country, in which Jesus made his appearance, who have observed the state of society and the municipal customs, or who have also collected the subordinate events, which have a more proximate or more remote reference to occurrences connected with the New Testament, and were moreover noticed in the narrative; then, they made a more critical inquiry into the individuals commemorated in history, who, particularly in Palestine, bore a part in the events of the age, and explored the leading points of their life and character preserved by the ancients, for the sake of examining the historical books of the New Covenant by these data, and submitting the opinions of their authors to the test [c].

But these authors in general display such an uncommon knowledge of circumstances, and such an intimate acquaintance with the period in which the actions of Jesus occur, as could have been known to none but contemporaries.

The more we would enter into particulars on this

[c] The credibility of the Gospel-history, or the facts occasionally mentioned in the New Testament, confirmed by passages of ancient authors, by Nathaniel Lardner, Lond. 1727, and second edition 1733. In Latin, with a preface by Christoph. Wolfius, Bremen, 1730: in German, with Baumgarten's preface, Berlin and Leipsic, 1750. Also in a View of the Evidences of Christianity, in three parts, by William Paley, in two volumes, fourth edition, London, 1795. In German, a View and Examination of the Proofs and Evidences of Christianity, with a preface, by Professor Noesselt, Leipsic, 1797, 2 vols. §. 2. part of the 6th chapter.

point, and observe the effect of opinions, customs, and manners peculiar to this time, in the language and undertakings of trafficking individuals, by so much the more intrinsically evident must it be, that the composers of these books passed their days under these circumstances of life.

From hence depends the conduct of Jesus as a moral instructor; from hence proceed the behaviour of others towards him, and their opposition to him, and from motives such as these is the description of particular situations proved to be true.

When he comes in contact with the Pharisees, the reciprocal conduct of both parties, the positions which he in this case proposes, and the application of them must be managed by presuppositions totally different from those when he addresses the Sadducees, and is in company with them. When he has an intercourse with the Samaritans, he again commences another chain of ideas, which bring other conditions of life into play, and which indicate a social tone. But, when he stands among his own followers, or addresses himself to the people, different hopes, desires, and prejudices, a perfectly different sense and belief with which he has then to do, and another circle of opinions through which his discourses run, are exhibited; but in their ordinary transactions they again seem another people, on the one hand, susceptible of truth of heart, zealous, and fearing God; although, on the other, we behold them vehement, easily excited, impetuous in religion, precipitately prone to violent measures, to the consequences of which they are blind.

If we, however, collect all that may be adduced from the ancients upon the subject, and then apply it to certain occurrences in the New Testament, we continually discover ourselves both in the principal

matter and incidental points transferred to things connected with these days and their circumstances. The Pharisees and the Sadducees existed, and believed, as these books have described them: such were the prejudices of the Samaritans, such was the mutual dislike between them and the Jews; such was the spirit of the nation: and as their character is announced in the history of the age, so is it treated, and so it survives in the New Testament, easily affected, quick and blind in their emotions, thoughtless and forgetful of the law, being between two constitutions, and readily roused to tumultuous displays of their own power.

Thus were they circumstanced with respect to foreign notions and regulations, which crept into their system, and gave to their national condition a bias, which it first had under Herod the Great, but never afterwards. The insidious question of the *census* contains in it all the re-awakened prejudices of the Jews, and exhibits their disposition towards the Romans as they really were[a]. The precept of reconciliation in Matt. v. 25. Luke xii. 58. was enjoined in every item with a view to the Roman law *de injuriis*, according to which the complainant, with his own hand, dragged the accused before the judge, without magisterial summons, *in jus rapit:* yet, according to which, on the road, an agreement, *transactio*, remains open to him: but, should not this be accomplished, THE MULCT assuredly awaits him, which, if he does not discharge, he continues in prison until its liquidation[b].

[a] Joseph. de Bell. Jud. l. ii. c. 12. p. 727. ed. Basil, or Havercamp's ed. l. ii. c. 8. cf. Antig. l. xviii. c. 1; n. 6; also l. xvii. c. 3 and 4.

[b] Heineccii Antiqq. jur. Rom. Illust. l. iv. Tit. 4. n. 1. seqq. cf. l. iv. Tit. 6. n. 14 and 16.

When Jesus is in conversation or company with publicans, the Roman system of farming and its oppressions are every where displayed. When he drives with scourges the money-brokers from the Temple, we perceive the consequences of the Roman dominion, and, moreover, the influence of foreign manners, which allowed the *argentarii* to establish their usurious *mensas* by the statutes of the gods, even at the feet of Janus (Horat. Epist. l. i. Ep. 1.) in the most holy places, *in porticibus Basilicarum*, or in [f] the Temples, *pone ædem Castoris*; we also observe the Roman toleration, which permitted no encroachments in the temples and religions of other nations, since a private Jew, unmolested, maintained the holiness of HIS temple, from which, in Rome, no laws could have screened him.

The parable in Matt. xviii. 23. represents a king, *i. e.* a tetrarch, who, as far as himself and his own affairs were concerned, was not under the Roman law: he consequently proceeds according to the ancient Jewish law; but the sequel which relates to a common man contains an appeal to the Roman laws against the *obæratos*, in consequence of which the debtor who does not pay, is called upon by his creditor, *addicebatur*, who instantly arrests him *in nervum ducebat*, and detains him in his house as a prisoner, as one delivered up to his will. The harshness of this law was indeed mitigated *per legem Poeteliam*, yet afterwards, and at this time, it had returned to its former severity, as it here appears in the moral parable [g].

This admixture of manners and constitutions

[f] Symbol. litt. Bremens. T. 1. N. Funccii dissert. de hominib. in foro Rom. nequam.

Cf. Drackenborch's note to Livy, l. viii. c. 38. Gellii Noch. Att. l. xx. c. 4. p. 282. Aldi Manut. Tacit. Annales iii. c. 60.

forcibly proceeded through numberless circumstances of life. Take for example the circulation of coin: at one time it is Greek coin, at another Roman, at another ancient Jewish. But how carefully was even this managed according to history, and the arrangement of things? The ancient imposts which were introduced before the Roman dominion, were valued according to the Greek coinage: *e. g.* the taxes of the temple, the δίδραχμον, Matt. xvii. 24. Joseph. B. J. L. vii. c. 6. n. 6. The offerings were paid in these; Mark xii. 42. Luke xxi. 2. A payment which proceeded from the temple-treasury, was made according to the ancient national payment by weight, Matt. xxvi. 15. But in common business, trade, wages, sale, &c. the *assis* and *denarius* and Roman coin were usual; Matt. x. 29., Luke xii. 6., Matt. xx. 2., Mark xiv. 5., John xii. 5. vi. 7. The more modern state-taxes are likewise paid in the coin of the nation which exercises at the time the greatest authority: Matt. xxii. 19, Mark xii. 15., Luke xx. 24.

Writers, who in each little circumstance, which otherwise would pass by unnoticed, so accurately describe the period of time, must certainly have had a personal knowledge of it.

SECTION IV.

We might enter on this inquiry, likewise, merely from geographical views. The geographical and topographical state of a country changes from time to time, through industry, diligence in the arts, cultivation of the land, natural phænomena, politics, and arms; it is in a continual state of fluctuation, which not merely in greater spaces of time or

epochs, but even in shorter periods, produces novel appearances and transformations. Writers, desirous of employing themselves on an historical occurrence, which time places at a certain distance from them, are therefore exposed to considerable error; and we may easily judge from their writings how near they lived to the period of which they describe the events, or how long from it. It was particularly difficult to the ancients to avoid blunders in this point, since very few native geographical aids were at their command. The history of literature affords several examples of deceivers, who were detected in this manner. We would not, however, bring them further into notice, had not great and enlightened writers used them as authorities and sometimes permitted themselves to be ensnared by the same errors.

Glareau, formerly an ornament of the school of Freyburg, disputed the authenticity of Quintus Curtius from the geographical mistakes of which this historian was guilty. The ancients also found fault with a striking [b] blunder of this sort, in Virgil. It even sometimes happened to Titus Livius that from forgetfulness, he adapted a more modern geography to ancient events; thus, he speaks of Sinuessa, Præneste, Arpi, where he should have mentioned Synope, Argos-Hippium, and Stephane.

But the remark which we have the opportunity of making concerning the life of Apollonius Tyanæus on this subject, must have been formerly especially agreeable to the Christians. Philostratus, the philosopher, is its author, who, according to his own account, compiled this biography from the commentaries and writings of Damis, who was not only a contemporary, but the friend and companion of Apol-

[b] Aul. Gellius, Noct. Att. l. x. c. 16.

lonius in all his travels. Among other things, the hero of the book makes his appearance in Babylon, on which occasion, one of the best descriptions of this celebrated city is given to us; but with reference to time, there is not one word of truth in it, since Babylon lay solitary and nearly deserted, as Seleucia had for a long time absorbed its splendour [i]. He confounds the people of Sparta with the Lacedæmonians, as formerly, when together they formed one state. He represents Sparta as a free state, when it was under the Roman Dominion, and those only who were called Eleuthero-Lacones, remained separated from Sparta, free men [k] through the beneficence of Augustus. Can such accounts, then, be those of an eye-witness and contemporary? Is it not here evident that these Commentaries of Damis are forgeries, and that the author of this biography by no means compiled it from those contemporary sources, which he boasts?

If then persons, who possessed not this extended literature, prefix the names of older writers to their works, for the sake of imparting to them a value from their antiquity, of what possible benefit can they be? We need only notice the history of the Jewish war, which is circulated under the name of Hegesippus the Jew. He lived under Antoninus and Commodus; yet mention is made of Constantinople, of Scotland, and Saxony [l], in the book.

If the difficulties were, in general, so great for a writer, who selected ancient events for his purpose, and would state them on the authority of the contemporary geographical condition of the country, they were by far greater for a writer, who had to

[i] Vita Apollon. Tyan. per Philostratum, Lemn. Sen. l. 1. c. 18.
[k] *Loco* citato, l. iv. c. 2.
[l] Hegesipp. de Bell. Jud. l. iii. c. 5., and l. v. c. 15.

treat of occurrences in the Jewish state, which came to pass immediately, before his exposition of them, since he was not born until they had taken place. The numerous changes which preceded this period, the awful event itself, which made the principal city and its environs so difficult of recognition, that, as an eye-witness expresses himself [m], it might be doubted whether men had ever inhabited them; the consequent vicissitudes, which gave a new appearance to the whole land, rendered it almost impossible, that a person living in a subsequent age should be able to develope them. If we bear in mind, that under Hadrian fifty places of magnitude, and nine hundred and eighty-five villages and hamlets were totally destroyed [n], we may judge of the pretensions of the writer, who would describe the land as it was in the days of Tiberius.

The laborious compilations and united works of the learned on the geography and topography of Palestine in their different epochs have placed us in a situation to judge how far the historical books of the New Testament afford such contemporary views of the country, and unite each chorographical circumstance with the events, which were peculiar to the period to which the facts belong. Although these compilations and works have many chasms, and they must necessarily have them, yet, they are in such a condition, that we can, with certainty, detect and notice their errors, and refer such writings to their proper age, as would unjustly arrogate to themselves a higher antiquity.

But, all these learned inquiries and collations may

[m] Joseph. de Bell. Jud. l. vii. c. 1.

[n] Dio Xiphilin. in vitâ Hadriani. p. 266. Hen. Steph. 8vo. ed. Wechel. p. 974.

be considered as an inductive authority, according to which a full insight into the geographical state of the time in which the events occurred, must be conceded to the historical books of the New Testament. We now bring certain instances to the test, among which there are some, to the elucidation of which we may now and then make some brief additions.

Our historians, without expressly mentioning topographical and geographical circumstances, often speak in such a way, that they involve themselves in the events, and must be so apprehended by the reader. The more we become acquainted with the place and its situation, the more self-evident is it, that the description of it has been very accurately treated according to the locality.

Jesus is brought before Pilate to be judged, but the Jews wished it not to be within the Prætorium, (lest they should be defiled) on account of the feast. Consequently, he allows Jesus to be brought out, that he may receive his sentence; but Pilate sat on the LITHOSTROTON, as a tribunal, John xix. 3. The transaction is so represented, as if this place was before the house of the Prætor, or at least, at no very great distance from it. And such a place, which has been overlooked, is really found in the outworks of the Temple; it is mentioned as the situation of an attack which the Romans made on the Temple, on the side of the TURRIS ANTONIA[a]. Here is the LITHOSTROTON: it therefore merely hence appears, that the house of the Prætor was near to it. But he dwelt in the palace of Herod as

[a] Joseph. Bell. Jud. l. vi. c. 6 and 7. p. 868 and 869. Ed. Basil, και κατα λιθοστρωτον τρεχων. κ. τ. λ. Havercamp. l. n. 8.

[b] Philo de legat. ad. Caium, says, Pilate had a golden shield (of which Josephus also, Archæol. l. xviii. c. 3. gives an account) hung ἐν τοις Ἡρωδου βασιλειοις, and observes likewise, that this was the case

appears from some accidental words of Philo. This was certainly in this division and neighbourhood, north-west of the TURRIS ANTONIA and the Temple, so that the proximity of the LITHOSTROTON to the palace, as the narrative of St. John asserts, is perfectly true.

Peter and John go to the Temple: as they arrived at "THE BEAUTIFUL GATE," a man requested alms of them, who was lame from his birth, and was usually brought therein to beg. They made him sound: he goes into the Temple: the people throng around him, astonished at his recovery. The apostles follow him: he perceives them in Solomon's porch, steps forward from the multitude, and embraces them, as his preservers, Acts iii. A gate of this description, which exceeded all the rest in beauty, led from the east, into the Temple, but the στοα Σολομωντος was situated in the eastern direction also [r], so that the transaction, as one part of it follows another, is not even disjointed as to situation, or distributed into passages not to be reconciled together, but it is described according to the order of the building.

Beth-phage, a place of no consequence in itself, and otherwise forgotten in history, is frequently mentioned in the Gospels; Matt. xxi. 1, Mark xi. 1, Luke xix. 29. According to them it was without the city, and not far from Jerusalem. It so occurs, that the Talmudical books have noticed it, but in a manner totally different from the Gospels. Accord-

in the dwelling of the Prætors; και τοτε μεν ἡ ἀναλυσις ἐν οἰκια των Ἐπιτροπων. Cf. Faber's Archæology of the Hebrews, p. 1. p. 323 in the note.

[r] Joseph. Bell. Jud. l. v. c. 14. p. 841. Basil and Haverc. c. 5. n. 3.

[s] Joseph. Arch. l. xx. c. 8. p. 621. and Haverc. c. 9. n. 7.

ing to them, Beth-phage lay not without but within the city. So Lightfoot, a man well informed in this branch of literature asserts in *Chorogr. Matthæo præmissa,* c. 37. where he without hesitation introduced Beth-phage within the compass of the city walls. Reland, who was best qualified to have given assistance on this point, merely contented himself with censuring him.

In Gemarâ Babylonicâ in Mishnam Sanhedrin c. i. § 3., the question is started respecting the red heifer, in a case where the dead body of a murdered person was found *uncovered in the city:* נמצא בעליל לעיר. The reply is, that they must go to see it. But, should it be found in Beth-phage, מצאן אבית פגי and in this case, should the inhabitants resist the decision, is it to be considered as proof of an insurrection in Beth-phage? The answer is, that they must also go there to see. Two cases are here manifestly opposed to each other:—that in the city, and that at Beth-phage. Yet, Lightfoot ventures to corrupt it by a gloss. בית־פגי מקום לפנים מן חומת העיר ונדון לירושלים לכל דבריו. The passage cannot mean, without violence, "Si invenerit Synedrium considens in Beth-phage," &c. We have no where an account of a Synedrium in Beth-phage. מצאן is used in reference to כי ימצא חלל in Deut. xxi. 1., when such a *corpus delicti* should be found. The gloss, likewise, accurately considered, will not suit Lightfoot's purpose. Indeed, in the Talmudical dialect, פנים more frequently signifies *within,* or *the interior;* but then the subsequent part of the sentence would be superfluous: for if it be within the walls of the city, of course it must be understood that it was also considered as the city itself. He would have therefore better translated it: Beth-phage locus est in conspectu mœnium urbis, quantum

ad omnia tamen utebatur jure Hierosolymorum. The second passage which he alleges from Gemar. Babyl. Tract. Pesachim, corroborates still less his assertion. To the question, what is without the walls? R. Johannan replies חוץ לחומות בית פאגי. Both in the question and the answer *est* must be understood:—extra mœnia est Beth-phage. This the gloss says, in another way, מקום חיצון שברושלם a place, *outside* of which is Jerusalem. In the Mishnah, Tract. Menacoth, c. xi. n. 1, 2, R. Jehudah maintains on the question: Whether the shew-bread and the two breads of the Pentecost, which were baked in the courts of the Temple, might lawfully be kneaded *without* בחוץ, their precincts?—that all must be completed in the Temple. Against which R. Simeon adduces a tradition, that they may be as well kneaded in Beth-phage as in the courts of the Temple. The fanciful illustration of this passage by Maimonides, although disregarded, says, they may be as well kneaded not only in the courts of the Temple, but, also, in Jerusalem, and even in the immediately contiguous places, which enjoy the same privileges as Jerusalem. The book ספרי the oldest commentary on the fourth book of Moses on ch. xxix. 35. concludes from the word עצרת, that no one may go out of Jerusalem, on the great day of the feast: cf. Mishn. Tr. Megill. c. I. n. 11. Yet, it makes this exception, that, whoever has come from Beth-phage may go to his own house, and take his night's rest at Beth-phage. עצרו תכתוב מלצאת הרי שהביא קדשיו מבית־פגי לירושלם שומע אני יאכלם בירושלם וילן בבית־פגי: All of which passages separate Beth-phage from Jerusalem, but shew it to have been situated in the vicinity of the city, yet without the walls, and in the view of them. From the expression whether, when Beth-phage was in a state

of tumult, it might be styled an insurrection? we may conclude how important this place was, as to the greatness and number of its inhabitants.

Curiosity impels a tax-gatherer at Jericho to ascend a tree, that he may see Jesus; and at Capernaum our Lord calls a gatherer of the port-customs from the place of receiving them, to follow him. Both are very correct.

In the vast valley, which the mountainous country round Jericho forms, grew the balsam, which was the chief produce of Judea and was its most excellent and most abundant branch of trade[s]. From thence it was sent to different parts, and the royal dues on the duties placed upon it must have been received here. Therefore, the tax-gatherer is, chorographically, in his proper place.

The Phœnicians and in particular the Arabs sent their loads of merchandize by means of the Jordan into the southern regions[t]. Their entrance-station was, therefore, necessarily, to the north of Gennesareth, and at Capernaum, and the impost-collector for transit and importation could not be wanting in this place.

Our Lord was at Capernaum:—he goes the next day to Nain: Luke vii. 1—11. Fame precedes him in a straight direction to Judea:—he arrives in the neighbourhood of the Baptist, 9, 17, 18., and goes still more to the south, in the vicinity of the holy city, where the Magdalene dwells. Luke, as we perceive, is describing a journey of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem. Now Josephus says, that when the

[s] Justin. Epitome Trogi l. xxxv. c. 3. opes gentis ex vectigalibus opobalsami crevere.

[t] Strabo. l. xvi. p. 519. Casaub. 1587. τον Λυκον, και τον Ἰορδανην διαπλεουσι φορτιοις Ἀραβιοι μαλιστα, κ. τ. λ.

Galilæans, at the periods of the feasts, go to the holy city through Samaria, they come through a place called Nais, which lies in their way. Ἐθος ἠν τοις Γαλιλαιοις ἐν ταις ἑορταις εἰς την ἱεραν πολιν παραγενομενοις ὁδευειν δια της Σαμαριων χωρας, και καθ' ὁδον αὐτοις κωμης της ΝΑΙΣ λεγομενης. Ant. l. xx. c. 6. Jesus, therefore, in his tract follows the course of road, which leads him through this small town, where we meet him in a successful operation of miracles. Luke vii. 11—17.

But Hudson and Havercamp deprive us of the passage in Josephus, and alter the name of the place, although it be not so written in all MSS.; they read κωμης Γιναιας λεγομενης. Yet, why do they alter the text? The greatest number of MSS. and books have Naïς; according to Ruffinus, the other readings are Ναναïς, Γεναïς, Γενεας, Γιναïς. Consequently, Ναναïς is a mere error, occasioned by the repetition of the two first letters, and easily is resolved into Naïς. Even Γιναïς and Γιναιας originated from Naïς. If half of the letter T, as often is the case, were obliterated in the article Της Naïς, we should then have κωμης Γης Naïς λεγομενης, and this γης would explain the conjectures of the Librarii.

The second passage in Josephus, where he again relates the same facts, is still more corrupt in its readings. Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 12. n. 3. Γημαν, Ωβαν, Βαν, βουν. We may easily shew how Γημαν arose from the preceding Γιναιαν, and it is as plain, how Naïν degenerated in the cursive writing into βαν. It is well known, that in the MSS. of the 10th to the 13th century, the β very nearly resembled the ν, and that it is difficult to distinguish the α from the αι. The third passage, which notices this place, Bell. Jud. L. iii. c. 3. n. 4., gives us the readings, Γιναιας,

Γινιας, Γηνιας, GENANIÆ, again, the old Γι-ναιας—Γη-νιας—Γη-ναναιας modelled on της ναιας.

But, to make this still clearer, we must remark, that this disputed place was situated on the plain, μεγα πεδιον, on which the Samaritan territory bordered, Ant. xx. 6., or on the plain, where the Samaritan land commenced, Bell. Jud. ii. 12. 3. iii. 3. 4. Reland very clearly distinguishes two commons or plains of this description, Palæstin. l. i. c. 55. μεγα πεδιον Λεγεωνος, which stretched southwards towards Samaria, and μεγα πεδιον προς Πτολεμαϊδα, which extended north-westwards towards Ptolemais; both met together at the foot of Tabor. But, here, at the southern foot of Tabor, at a small distance from it, consequently, at the entrance of the Samaritan plain, lay Nain. Euseb. de loc. Hebr. Ναΐς κωμη. ... και νυν ἐστι μετα νοτον Θαβωρ. Concerning its distance the note of Vallarsi ad h. l. opp. Hieronym. T. iii. p. 285, and Relandi Palæst. l. iii. v. *(Nain)* may be consulted. Luke calls the place πολις, Josephus only κωμη. Yet, this makes no difference; for it is the custom of Josephus to mention smaller places, only under the name of κωμη, even if they have walls and gates and fortifications. Antiq. xvii. c. 2. n. 2. c. 10. n. 9. xx. c. 6. n. 2. Bell. Jud. iv. c. 2. n. 3. c. 8. n. 4. 5.

The city of Gaza is named in the Acts of the Apostles viii. 26.; with the remark that "it is now desert,"—αὐτη ἐστιν ἐρημος . This had often been its fate; but it was continually rebuilt, and indeed not long before the events here related, viz. in the days of Herod the Great. To remove this difficulty more than ordinary learning has continually been employed,

* Hug has made an error in his quotation, which has been corrected in the translation: his words are, "sie sey nunmehr verwüstet —αὐτη ἐστω ἐρημος." *Translator.*

(Wesseling. not. ad Diod. L. xix. c. 80. p. 381. T. i. et ad. Itinerar. Antonini p. 151. Relandi Palæstin. p. 786.) yet, two words in Josephus have escaped the notice of those learned men by whom we are informed, how well St. Luke knew an event, about which all history besides was silent. A short time before the siege of Jerusalem, the Jewish revolution acquired a different character in consequence of an injustice which happened to the Jews in Cæsarea, in revenge for which they burnt or totally laid waste a number of villages and cities in Syria and the neighbourhood, amongst which was Gaza, which they destroyed, (Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 33. p. 751. Basil. c. 18. n. 1. Haverc.) ἀλλ ἐπι ταυταις πυρποληθεισαις, Ἀνθηδονα και Γαζαν κατεσκαπτον. It was therefore actually then in this state when Luke wrote.

At Philippi there was a dealer in purple from Thyatira, (Acts xvi. 14.) and indeed an inscription has been found among the ruins of Thyatira, which corroborates the fact that this city once had a trade of this sort, which maintained an incorporated society of its own [x].

ΑΓΑΘΗ ΤΥΧΗ
ΑΝΤ. ΚΛ. ΑΛΦΗΝΟΝ ΑΡΙΓΝΩΤΟΝ
ΚΡΑΤΙΣΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΕΒ.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - ΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΣΕΜΝΟΤΑΤΟΝ ΙΕΡΕΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟ
ΠΟΛΕΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΤΥΡΙΜΝΟΥ
ΟΙ ΒΑΦΕΙΣ.

The Acts of the Apostles make mention of the proconsul of Cyprus, yet here he should be a prætor. According to the division of the Roman

[x] George Wheeler's Journey into Greece, b. iii. p. 233; in the French translation, V. i. p. 216. Spon has more correctly given this inscription, in his Miscellanea Erudit. Antiquitatis, p. 113.

dominions, as Augustus planned it, Cyprus fell to the share of the Emperor, and therefore could never have been under pro-consular government. The attempts which have been made to remove the difficulty have in general failed. Coins alone are able now to certify us how correctly Luke was acquainted with these times. Some coins with the image and titles of Claudius Cæsar shew us, on the reverse side, that this change really took place; they make us acquainted with a proconsul of Cyprus, who was the predecessor or successor of Sergius Paulus[y]. ΚΥΠΡΙΩΝ, stands in the centre of the reverse, and the inscription in the circle is extended round the name of the island or its inhabitants:

ΕΠΙ ΚΟΜΙΝΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΚΛΟΥ ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΥ.

Paul comes in an Alexandrian vessel to Puteoli, (Acts xxviii. 11. 13, 14.) where he landed, and was obliged to perform the rest of his journey to Rome by land. The Alexandrian merchant vessels preferred Puteoli (Pozzuoli) to all the harbours in Italy, and here they deposited their rich freights[z]. They conducted the crew adorned with wreaths and festive garments, in the form of a fleet, one after another, into the harbour, where they were received with the greatest demonstrations of friendship[a]. Such was

[y] Patin. Imp. Rom. numism. in Claud. p. 101. who however does not give a happy illustration. Thesaurus Morellianus sive famil. Rom. numism. ed. Havercamp in famil. Comin. p. 106. I have since perceived that this explanation does not merely rest on coins. Dio Cass. L. LIV., in Augusto, p. 523. ed Wechel: τοτε δ' οὖν και την Κυπρον και την Γαλατιαν την Ναρβωνησιαν ἀπεδωκε τῳ δημῳ, ὡς μηδεν των ὁπλων αὐτου δεομενας, και οὑτως ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΙ και ἐς ἐκεινα τα ἐθνη πεμπεσθαι ἠρξαντο.

[z] Strabo. L. xvii. p. 793. 2d. Casaub.

[a] Seneca. Ep. L. xxvii. Sueton. in August. c. 98.

the case with the sale of Alexandrian commodities throughout Italy [b]. According to the course then pursued by this vessel, Paul went direct into this harbour and no further, either backwards or forwards, on the land.

His friends awaited his arrival at FORUM APPII: and others at TRES TABERNÆ (Acts xxviii. 15.) For he came by the canal, which Cæsar had made through the Pontine marshes, by which the journey was performed with less trouble than on the rough road at its side; consequently he disembarked at the FORUM APPII, at the place for lading and unlading [c]. A party of his friends was therefore desirous of receiving him at his landing. Ten Roman miles, or two German miles farther, towards Rome was the station called TRES TABERNÆ, probably where the road from Velletri joins the Pontine marshes [d]. The bustle here was less noisy, and there were not so many inconveniences as at FORUM APPII [e]; on which account the place appears to have been one of entertainment for the higher ranks [f]. This party of Paul's friends were also received into the most commodious place; and the whole is a true description of the places and their then local conditions.

The manifold changes in the names of places, which in a short time follow one another, often expose our writers to the danger of making a mistake,

[b] Strabo. loc. citato.

[c] Acron ad Horat. Serm. L. i. Sat. v. 14. quâ ab Appii foro per paludes navigatur, quas paludes Cæsar derivavit. Porphyrion advers. 4. pervenisse ad Forum Appii indicat, ubi turba esset nautarum, item cauponum ibi morantium. Acron ad vers. 11. per paludes navigarunt, quia via interjacens durior.

[d] Itinerar. Antonini edit. Wesseling. p. 107.

[e] Horat. Serm. L. i. Sat. v. 8, 4. 11, 12.

[f] Cicero ad Attic. L. ii. Ep. 11 and 13.

Augustus was even anxious that the world might forget that she was his daughter[j]. Tiberius, whose wife she had been, consigned the unfortunate Princess after the death of Augustus to the most abject poverty, under which she sank without assistance[k]. Thus adulation must under two reigns have suppressed a name, from which otherwise it might have wished to derive benefit to itself. At a later period this name again came into circulation, and appears in Pliny in his Catalogue of Jewish Cities. By such incidents, which are so easily overlooked, and the knowledge of which is afterwards lost, do those who are really acquainted with an age disclose their authenticity[l].

But it is strange, some one will say, that John reckons this Bethsaida or Julias, where he was born, in Galilee (xii. 21.) Should he not know to what province his birth-place belongs[m]? Philip only governed the eastern districts by the sea of Tiberias; but Galilee was the portion of his brother Antipas. Bethsaida or Julias could therefore not have been built by Philip, as the case is, or it did not belong to Galilee, as John alleges. In fact such an error were sufficient to prove that this Gospel was not

[j] Abstinuitque à congressû hominum diù præ pudore, etiàm de negandâ deliberavit. Certè, cùm, sub idem tempus una ex consciis, liberta, Phœbe nomine, suspendio vitam finivisset, maluisse se, ait, Phœbes patrem fuisse. Sueton. in Aug. c. 65.

[k] Tacit. Annal. L. i. n. 53. Imperium adeptus (Tiberius) extorrem, infamem, et omnis spei egenam, inopiâ et longâ tabe peremit, obscuram fore necem longitudine exilii ratus.

[l] Pellerin, recueil des medailles, Tom. i. and ii. produces some coins of Julia, and one also of Julias of this age. So it was believed, until Eckhel detected the mistake in Doctrina Numm. Vet. Part I. Vol. iii. p. 497, 498.

[m] Brun's Manual of Ancient Geography, 2d Vol. 1st Part, c. vi. p. 58.

written by John. Julias, however, was situated in Gaulonitis, which district was for very political reasons divided from Galilee; but the ordinary language of the time asserted its own opinion, and reckoned the Gaulonitish province in Galilee. When therefore, John does the same, he proves, that the unexpected peculiarity of these days was not unknown to him; for, he expresses himself after the ordinary manner of the period. Thus Josephus informs us of Judas the Gaulonite from Gamala [n], and also calls him in the following chapters, the Galilæan, and then in another work he applies the same expression to him [o], from whence we may be convinced that the custom of these days paid respect to a more ancient division of the country, and bade defiance, in the present case, to the then existing political geography.

Is it possible that historians who, as it is evident from these few examples, discover throughout so nice a knowledge of the geographical arrangements in all their minutiæ, should have written at a time when the theatre of events was unknown to them, when not only their native country was destroyed, but their nation scattered, and the national existence of the Jews extinguished and extirpated?

SECTION V.

The didactical writings also have internal marks, or, as they are called, the impression of a particular age, as well with respect to the materials as to the form.

[n] Archæol. xviii. 1. Ἰούδας Γαυλονίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὀνόμα Γαμάλα.

[o] xviii. 2. Ὁ Γαλιλαιος Ἰούδας, p. 549. De Bell. Jud. ii. 12. p. 727. τις ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαιος Ἰούδα ὀνομα. Ed. Havercamp xviii. c. 1. n. 6. et Bell. Jud. ii. c. 8.

As to the materials, they may be distinguished in regard to the object, about which men's numerous inclinations and modes of thinking vary ; or they have temporary and local references to persons, manners, errors, and follies, which vary at different times and in different countries.

As to the form :—in the arrangement and mode of treating things, in proofs to support assertions or in style and diction.

These considerations at present are applicable only to writings about which there is no doubt, to the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, and the first of Peter and John; of the others we shall elsewhere speak, and of each in particular.

As far as it relates to the materials, these writings are not general treatises without a country and distinct object: they were called forth by occasions and circumstances compulsory on the writers, and were therefore adapted to particular situations and readers, and their individual necessities. Since these are confirmed in other documents, since the picture of the times which the authors preserve in them, as they write these memoirs, has historical truth, we easily perceive that writers such as these did not labour on arbitrary circumstances or those invented by themselves. The more circumstantial this picture was, and the more accurately it was present to their mind, so much the more is it demonstrated that they saw these very times.

Moreover, in the Acts of the Apostles, we meet with a considerable number of undesigned data negligently scattered here and there, which now and then relate to the persons, or are connected with other incidents which are mentioned in St. Paul's Epistles, or promise even further instructions for their accidental elucidation. Where, then, we observe

such an historical and obvious directory belonging to them, and connect these memoirs with them, we cannot but remark between them a harmony, which is particularly requisite to the Epistles[p]; which, according to their own pretensions, claim a connection with these events.

If we afterwards pay attention to the local weaknesses, imperfections, and errors which are censured in Paul's Epistles, to the correction of which they were designed, viz. in Crete, Corinth, Ephesus; if we pay attention to these, in the Greek and Roman authors, where some such traits are incidentally reprobated, we may often make the agreeable discovery, that our Epistles have accurately treated of the errors of the age, or the local imperfections, noticed in each Epistle, and have sometimes delineated them strongly in satire and seriousness. In some Epistles, we shall be in a situation to substantiate this observation by proofs, to which we here appeal.

But the leading subject is of a striking and peculiar character in the writings of Paul, Peter, and John. It gives to us a new system of morality,—it discloses a new system of virtue, by no means of the Jewish school, but one more beneficial to man, more general, purer, and more exalted. It is not even the virtue of the Greeks, not the political and warlike virtue of the Romans, not the virtue of the porch or of the academy, not even a sophisticated and declamatory wisdom of this life. It is the virtue of Jesus

[p] *This argument has been felicitously managed by William Paley in his Horæ Paulinæ, or the truth of the Scripture-History of St. Paul evinced, by a comparison of his Epistles with the Acts of the Apostles.* London, 1790. We may even invert the case as he *has stated it in* his title. There is a German translation of it, with *notes, by D. H*enke. Helmst. 1797.

Christ, as he had learnt and proposed it, on the authority of the four Gospels. The writers might, indeed, be supposed to be, as they have represented themselves,—his hearers and disciples.

In the Acts of the Apostles there are moral discourses of Paul, which exhibit his ideas of God and Jesus, of virtue, religion, and Judaism, and others of Peter, which exhibit his notions on this point. But we find them throughout so constituted, that they, as it were, form a whole with the contents of these Epistles, and both Epistles and narratives together unite in one theory, the separate parts of which are scattered through the representations of both.

That which occurs to John for the most part in the instructions and discourses of Jesus, and also survives more vigorously in his remembrance than in that of the other historians,—that, from which he has framed his Gospel, is prominently visible also in his Epistles; especially so, as here he was desirous of reducing into a compendium the result of his historical knowledge, for the purpose of moral instruction. Evidently the basis of both treatises was a similar chain of ideas, a similar direction of thoughts and character.

But, if we would draw our conclusions from a collation of the age, which certainly is a natural and just argument, if we would pass our judgment on the date of literary productions, if we scrutinize the written documents from the period that Christianity became now firmly established (for these are simply the Epistles of Polycarp, Clemens, Ignatius of Antioch, and Barnabas), it must readily appear to the experienced critic, that these treatises, whatever may be otherwise their value, are very from attaining the perfection and purity of moral views, and the intrinsic qualities observable in any one, which is ascribed to

Paul, Peter, and John; that *these* are much nearer to the spirit of Jesus, and that they have therefore a far greater claim to be referred to his times.

Moreover, if we bring forwards the most ancient religious document of the Jews after the dissolution of their state, *i. e.* the Mishna, which was compiled from traditions about the third century, it will be impossible to compute the vastness of the difference as to details of things, and the value of the contents, between it and these treatises. The Jews have so far descended in it, that we must go back with these Epistles to a better age, if they were, indeed, men of Jewish origin who composed it.

Besides, the form, the difference also in arranging the materials in the proofs, and in the tact of communicating things, as well as in the diction, characterizes the times and their productions.

Every where here is Christian virtue and religion, although taught by Jews,—but not by Jews of the Mishna, not in a casuistical parade, in a dry Hebræo-barbaric dialect, in tasteless and ungraceful imagery, but in the Judæo-Greek dialect (of that age of the nation, when the latter venerable laws were maintained in it, as well as in the language of the country), with an agreeable but artless eloquence, with an unsought elegance, which facts and nature, not the particular school, produced.

It evidently is allied to the language of Philo, and emulates his style, with this only difference, that Alexandrine wit, art, and learning, and a diction now a little Hebraizing, now pure, distinguishes him from these Jews, who, being educated only in Palestine, could have no knowledge of the lectures of the rhetoricians and sophists, or of the laws of the Grammarians. As to the rest, abstracting that which his particular residence had imparted to the Alexandrine

Jew, we might consider it, from the striking analogy of dialect and style, as connected with the time of this scholar. Let us in idea make an exchange of the countries and personal situations of both; then let us represent to ourselves how each might have written!

For instance,—they are so similar to each other in modes of proof, which depart from the general and common way of demonstration, that we might not only be tempted to refer them to one and the same time, but to one and the same school, except where the Alexandrian scholar discovers himself by the indiscreet freedom of his imagination, and the eternal excursions of his wit. But they perfectly agree in never departing from the authorities of older examiners of the law, as was afterwards common among the Jews, and in every where citing natural principles, and pre-eminently the holy books of their nation. But besides the literal meaning, a hidden sense was also attributed to these books. A representative property was ascribed to persons and things, according to which, whilst they were occupied with the purposes of their own existence, they yet typically expressed something else as emblems. Or else narratives founded on facts were made useful to morality, by means of *allegorical* and *tropological* applications of them.

We would, therefore, convince ourselves by an example, which appears peculiarly calculated to illustrate the similarity prevailing between them in the particular modes of proof. Philo asserts science and knowledge to be even without an object, excepting merely as they are calculated to be assistants to virtue and self-government, to which they lead, as their highest end, and which he would substantiate

from the history of Sarai and Hagar[q]. He says, "Sarai means my government; but it is virtue alone which raises me to government over myself and to royalty[r]." Hagar is an Egyptian woman: "her name means a native, and, as an Egyptian, she represents learning; both, therefore, presuppose an intimate acquaintance with literature and erudition. But Sarah is the wife, and Hagar merely the handmaid. Knowledge, therefore, is only a bondmaid and servant, which must be under virtue, as its higher object."

Paul is desirous of convincing the Galatians of the superiority of the New Testament over the Old. To this end he makes use of an allegory, as he calls it: Abraham had both by Sarah and Hagar, (the free-born and the bond-maid,) a son. But Hagar prefigures the law: for it was written on Mount Sinai, in the land of the Hagarenes; and Sarah prefigures the New Covenant, the Gospel, for a son was given to her ἐκ της ἐπαγγελιας. Now, as the servant is under

[q] Philo de Congress. quær. erudit. gratiâ.

[r] Philo's words are, το Σαῤῥας ὀνομα, μεταληφθεν ἐστιν ἀρχη μου φρονησις δε ἡ ἐν ἐμοι και σωφροσυνη δε ἡ ἐπι μερους δικαιοσυνη, και ἑκαστη των ἀλλων ἀρετων, ἡν περι ἐμε μονον εἰναι συμεβεβηκεν, ἀρχη ἐστιν ἐμου μονου. Ἐπισατει γαρ μου και ἡνεμονευει πειθαρχειν ἐγνωτος, βασιλις ἐκ φυσεως ὑπαρχουσα.—Γενος μεν ἐστιν Αἰγυπτια, καλειται δε Ἀγαρ· τουτοδε ἑρμηνευθεν ἐστι παροικησις. Ambrosius de Abrah. l. ii. c. 10, gives a similar derivation of the name; and this passage is quoted in Clemens, Strom. I. p. 333. Many derive Hagar's name from the root גור; but as she was an Ægyptian, this is improbable. Michaelis conjectures more wisely in referring its signification to the force of גֵּר, cognomina being frequent from incidents in the individual's history, whence the interpretation of הגר as *fugitive* will be agreeable to fact. The name of one of the cities of the Hagarenes is called גֵּר in Abulfeda and Edrisi. It is however evident, that Philo derived the name from גור. Whence Hug renders it *Eingeborne*, we are at a loss to discover.—Translator.

the mistress, so is the law under the Gospel, and the descendants of the first, who are slaves, are in a state of servitude, whilst the children of Sarah, *i. e.* the children of the promises, or of the Gospel, as sprung from a free mother, are free men.

Paul continues his allegory, and knew even how to draw from thence inferences for the abolition of Judaism, so managing them as not to weaken any part of his stronger assertions. We, also, as Isaac, are the children of the promises according to the Spirit; whilst, on the other hand, the descendants of the law are only children according to the flesh. But what is written respecting them? Drive forth the bond-maid, with her child: he shall not have an inheritance with the free-born. But we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free and the mistress.

Nearly in this manner does Philo treat this history in another place[a]. Sarah, the mistress, obtains a son, who receives his name from laughter[b], expressive of the joy which accompanies virtue. But Hagar, *i. e.* learning, bears a son, who is a sophist, and wisdom knows not virtue. Now, since learning will not serve virtue, what says the Scripture? Drive the bond-woman forth with her son. Hence the sophistical subtilties, which only generate errors, must give place to wisdom and virtue.

Numberless other similarities in particular ideas, in treatment of the subject, in the mode of proof, and the structure of it, have not escaped the friends of Biblical literature, and have been before remarked in elucidation of the striking passages in these Epistles; and many will yet be supplied by time and the observation of the learned.

[a] Philo de Cherubim, at the beginning.

[b] From the root פחק, to laugh.—Translator.

If this spirit be only once received in the treatment, development and representation of a subject, if in the following times of Judaism it became extinct, and no further trace of it has remained in the Talmudists, the critic can, as far as he forms his judgment of them from their style, only assign to these Epistles an origin in that age, which has disclosed actual proofs of a similar taste.

SECTION VI.

We have many remains of ancient literature, of the authenticity of which we are very well convinced, without requiring others as affording internal proofs. This is not the case with the writings of the New Testament: there is not even a single work, out of all the scientific writings of the Greeks and Romans, the origin and age of which might be established by so many witnesses and writers, who lived so near to the time to which such a work is referred. If our Scriptures, as it is commonly asserted, were composed not long before the destruction of the Jewish state, or soon after it (the first part under Nero, the last under Domitian), there would be witnesses down to the days of Dioclesian, removed from the close of this period at most but two centuries, in which neither assistance nor information to speak positively concerning them could be wanting, yet we rarely produce these testimonies in these inquiries.

For the sake of ascertaining how early the writings of the New Testament were in circulation among the Christians, the works of the oldest Fathers of the Church have been examined with indefatigable research, and the passages collected, which

have reference to them. An Englishman[a] has particularly distinguished himself in this laudable employment, who was soon followed by others, who examined his collection by stronger principles, and estimated it with critical circumspection.

This happened at that time, and the results thence arising in favour of the New Testament are known. I therefore have resolved to add a second proof to this, which will in a great degree corroborate it, and sometimes surpass it. The first ages of Christianity produced a multitude of sects, which were anxious to unite their philosophical and theurgical speculations with the doctrines of Christianity, and frequently lost themselves in strange admixtures of opinion,—in beautiful, but much oftener in ridiculous dreams. Yet even these sought to establish their assertions on the authority of the Biblical books, and to prove them against those indulging different sentiments, especially against the dominant Church. Their writings indeed are, for the most part, lost, and were destroyed on purpose, for which we have but little reason to thank piety; but the zeal for refuting them has occasionally preserved some fragments of their treatises, and their opponents have retained the proofs, which they adduced in support

[a] Nathaniel Lardner, in the Credibility of the Gospel-History,—established on the testimonies of the Christian teachers,—translated by David Bruhn, with Baumgarten's preface, 5 vol. 1750-51, Berlin and Leipsic; in which the above-mentioned "Credibility, in the facts occasionally mentioned in the New Testament," forms the first part, which only I have seen in English. Chr. Fred. Schmid in his Historia et Vindicatio Canonis, Leip. 1775, has made great use of his compilation. Gott. Less has critically amended it in his Truth of the Christian Religion, 1768; and in the fuller work on religion, its history and proof, v. I. §. 2. p. 29. Paley has at least availed himself of it with better judgment of selection, in his View and Evidences of Christianity, vol. I. §. 1. p. 141 of the German translation.

of their positions. Such passages have I resolved to collect which lead us further back into antiquity than the writings of the Fathers of the Church, which were afterwards written against them. For they assure us of the peculiar advantage of having been written by those men who seceded from the orthodox Church, and were on no terms of good understanding with it.

Besides, I have here only assigned a place to the witnesses of the second century, and admitted none, who existed several years after the death of Commodus. They all distinguished themselves as teachers under this monarch, or still earlier under the two Antonini, and their younger days fell in the time of Hadrian and Ulpius Trajan, under whom the last of the Apostles concluded his earthly course in extreme old age.

SECTION VII.

But before I say more of my proposition, it is necessary for me to prefix some remarks on the conduct of the most ancient Christian authors, to whatever school they may belong, respecting Biblical quotations, lest we should make arbitrary claims on them; and where these do not appear satisfactory, thence draw conclusions, which may be considered as principles, sufficiently strong to found on them a system of moral instruction.

In the first place, they have cited the Old Testament throughout as carefully as the New; although they naturally could not assume that the former was as well known to all their readers as the latter. They even appear to have made it a point of learning and literary display to cumulate passages from the Old Testament in their works, as, *e. g.* Clemens Roma-

nus, Barnabas, and Justin; but they never did it with the New, which was better known.

Secondly, they observed one mode with the historical books, and another with the didactical. They seldom transcribed from the Old or New Testament narratives at full length, or with the authors' words; and who would expect it from them? But, in their own peculiar style, they sometimes have quoted the writer's expression *memoritèr*, and almost, in general, abbreviated it. In such instances, the mere similarity of detail to one of our Gospels, is far from amounting to a proof that it was really taken from one of them. Such an occurrence might have been easily extracted from other historical books; but the circumstances which are therein related, depend on the individual description of the writer, of which one has selected this part, another that, or has even treated the whole carelessly and synoptically. These, therefore, more accurately help us to recognize a writer, and still more so do the style and choice of words when he details the narrative and his own private opinion. If now manifest proximities in the language and reminiscences of this nature occur, which frequently recall the original expression, so multifarious an agreement can no longer be considered, as the effect of chance, and we may with confidence depend on the allegation of this or that book in which the whole occurs.

Thirdly, they have mostly quoted the didactical writings of the Old Testament *verbatim*, and particularly the Prophets, by appeals to their names. The case required it:—for, who would exactly remember every passage, some of which are often nearly alike, were he ever so well read in them? or, who would know where to find them, unless the name were specified, and the expressions faithfully retained?

the identity of idea, that also of words takes place, in cases where variations are very possible.

Seventhly. We must, therefore, judge of the identity not according to the common printed text of the Elzevir Edition or that of Stephens: for it is not the rule by which we must judge. The text, as we shall perceive more fully in the history of it, had in the second century and the beginning of the third many peculiarities in some copies, as in the text of Justin, Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, and other Teachers, which have been removed by the revisers of the third century. Consequently, when variations are observed, they can only impede us, when they no where else appear in other writers of this age, or in MSS. which exhibit a very ancient text. If they again occur, we perceive that these dissimilarities are mere variations of ancient MSS. in the state in which they were at that time in circulation.

We now approach to the consideration of our proposition, and shall in its development much more forcibly treat it, than the preceding suggestions, which we just now have sketched, require.

SECTION VIII.

CELSUS,

A PHILOSOPHER of the second century, of the Epicurean school, composed a work against Christianity, to which he gave the title, ἀληθὴς λογος. Origen, in his refutation of it, has rescued a considerable part of this production from oblivion.

The philosopher mentions in it several circum-

the history of his passion, were written in the opinion of Celsus, by his disciples [x]. Shortly afterwards he says: we have extracted all this from your own writings, and we require no other witnesses, since your own weapons are sufficient for your destruction, (L. ii. c. 74.)

We evidently discern our Gospels in these historical facts, which Celsus has extracted from the books of the disciples of Jesus, and nothing in this respect is wanting, except that the Pagan might have mentioned the names of the writers, or the number of them, for the sake of imparting that perfection to his testimony which we desire.

Nevertheless, he has in a very remarkable manner particularized two of them: for he is of opinion that they were guilty of far too gross presumption, who derived the pedigree of Jesus from the first man and the kings of Judea; and he further observes, that the carpenter's wife could not but have known, of what high extraction she was [y]. There are, it is well known, two of our Evangelists, who have embodied in their works genealogical catalogues, in which the one actually traces back his genealogy of our Lord to the first man, whereas, the other enumerates the Jewish kings in their succession, and cites them as ancestors of Jesus.

The account, that Jesus shewed to his disciples the marks of his crucifixion, the wounds in his hands [z], after his resurrection, enables us to recog-

[x] L. ii. c. 13. and L. ii. c. 16. *τους δε Μαθητας, τους κατα τον Ἰησουν αναγεγραφεναι περι αὐτου τοιαυτα.*

[y] L. ii. c. 32. *ἀκηυθαδησθαι τους γενεαλογησαντας ἀπο του πρωτου φυντος, και των ἐν Ἰουδαιοις βασιλεων τον Ἰησουν· · και· · · · ὁτι οὐκ ἀν ἡ του τεκτονος γυνη τηλικουτον γενους τυγχανουσα ἠγνοει.*

[z] L. ii. c. 59.—*Και τα σημεια της κολασεως ἐδειξεν ὁ Ἰησους, και τας χειρας, ὡς ἠσαν πεπερονημεναι.*

nize a third of them, who alone has circumstantially noticed this circumstance, as it occurs in Celsus. (John xx.)

There were at least four such writers, whom the philosopher had seen: for he says, these have spoken only of one angel, who appeared at the grave, yet others have mentioned two angels *. Thus is it in our books; Matthew and Mark speak of one, Luke and John of two.

He also calls the works of these writers το εὐαγγελιον; and thus they were superscribed, as we have received from our forefathers, (L. ii. c. 27.)

Thus far will suffice concerning the historical books. But we also discover in Celsus traces of some Epistles of the Apostle Paul, which cannot remain unnoticed by the critic, (L. v. 64., vi. 12., viii. 24.) Yet since he names to us no written sources, from whence he has extracted these doctrines, (which are evidently those of St. Paul,) but only treats of them in general terms as Christian opinions, it is not permitted to us to suppose any thing more, than that which is contained in his expressions, or to draw a conclusion, as to written sources, where he only speaks of opinions, and of dogmata, which might have been known from oral information.

TATIAN AND JULIUS CASSIAN.

The first was a scholar of Justin Martyr; but his fancy and melancholy propensity to a severer life misled him into errors, and made him the founder of the Enkratites. He rejected marriage, and in one of

* L. v. c. 52.—Και μεν και προς τον αὐτου τουδε ταφον ἐλθειν ἀγγελον, οἱ μεν ἑνα, οἱ δε δυο τους ἀποκριυομενους ταις γυναιξιν, ὁτι ἀνεστη.

his Essays, περι του κατα τον Σωτηρα καταρτισμου, of which Clemens Alexandrinus has preserved fragments, he even asserted that it proceeded from Satan; he also disapproved of the use of flesh and wine.

Clemens (Strom. l. iii. § 12.) sets forth his opinions one against the other, and employs himself in a refutation of them; the following chapter he has reserved for Julius Cassian.

He there quotes a detached passage from the before-mentioned book of Tatian, ON PERFECTION ACCORDING TO THE REDEEMER, in which he says; "he permits matrimonial separation with mutual consent, for the sake of prayer." These are the words of Paul, whose name immediately precedes them. "But he only permits the matrimonial connection on account of Satan, and on account of incontinency." The passage, to which Tatian, τον αποστολον εξηγουμενος, here appeals is in substance 1 Cor. vii. 5. which is sufficiently clear to be immediately recognized; but he has not closely confined himself to the words, συφωνιαν μεν ουν αρμοζει προσευχη . . . παλιν γαρ επι ταυτο συγχωρησας γενεσθαι δια τον Σαταναν και την ακρασιαν. Yet, as we perceive, he has retained certain expressions of Paul; those for instance, from whence he principally advances to the decision of the question. Concerning another position in the Gospels, viz. δυσι κυριοις δουλευειν, which he has connected with this, we would say nothing farther, since he has too indefinitely inserted it.

Clemens now proceeds:—Tatian indeed allows marriage in the Old Testament, but not in the New; for he makes a distinction between τον παλαιον ανθρωπον και τον καινον. He then advances many arguments against him, as well for the sake of invalidating his assertion, as his dogmata concerning eating flesh and drinking wine. He then continues; "But, if any

an one rejects procreation, as that, which only presents materials of dissolution and decay, if any one perverts the words of our Saviour, where he says; ἐπι γης μη θησαυριζειν, ὑπου σης και βρωσις ἀφανιζει," &c. This expression of our Saviour, which with regard to diction is exactly cited, is in these very words in Matthew vi. 19, and in no other of the Evangelists besides. But, who is this such an one (τις) who thus perverted the passage? Is it Tatian or his disciple? This cannot signify much to us: however, it is Tatian, for the context relates to him. And, as he here complains of him, as τις,—(κατατρεχει τις της γενεσεως . . . βιαζεται τις . . .); he likewise commences his refutation of Tatian with the same phrase. "Marriage (he there says) is not, as some (τινες) interpret it a connection of the flesh inducing destruction. I here allude to Tatian, who has presumed to assert this; οὐ γαρ ὡς τινες ἐξηγησαντο Τατιανον οἰμαι τον Συρον, κ. τ. λ."

Shortly afterwards, he charges him and his followers with the misinterpretation of the words, οἱ υἱοι του αἰωνος ἐκεινου του περι νεκρων ἀναστασεως, οὐ γαμουσι, οὐδε γαμιζονται. They occur in the Evangelists Matthew xxii. 30., Mark xii. 25., Luke xx. 35. approaching the nearest to the words of Luke; yet nothing conclusive can be inferred from them; there therefore only remain to us from the Gospels, the passage in Matt. vi. 19, and that in John, which we have considered in the preceding remarks at No. 5.

We shall not here merely furnish ourselves with individual testimonies, but we shall pay our attention to a greater work of Tatian, which promises to us a signal proof of the existence of the four Gospels, arranged according to their whole contents. This is the δια τεσσαρων. We shall be necessarily more particular on this point than it would otherwise have

been necessary, had not so much trouble been taken to place this subject in obscurity.

Ephræm Syrus composed a commentary on this work, which the Syriac writers sometimes mention, and from which they were informed of the nature of the Diatessaron. Dionysius Bar-salibi gives the following account of it[b], "Tatian," says he, "the disciple of Justin the martyr and philosopher framed one out of the four Gospels, which he called Diatessaron. St. Ephræm elucidated it by a commentary; it commenced: In the beginning was the word," &c.

Eusebius records of a second branch of Tatian's school, which separated from it shortly after its foundation, viz. the Severians, that they received the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospels, but that they blasphemed Paul, and rejected the Acts of the

[b] Asseman. Biblioth. Or. T. i. p. 57. T. ii. p. 159, 60. But, Asseman T. i. p. 57, 58., quotes, shortly afterwards, (it might be objected) a passage from Bar-Hebræus, which attributes the book on which Ephræm composed his commentary to Ammonius. The matter throughout is uncertain, nor does it matter. The Monotessaron of Ammonius was by far the more popular among the Greeks, that of Tatian the Syrian, on the other hand, among the Syrians, in whose Churches Theodoret (Hær. fab. l. i. c. 20.) found and brought away many copies. On the contrary, the book of Ammonius was so scarce among the Syrians, that Elias of Salama, notwithstanding his researches, could not discover it. (Assem. B. or. T. ii. p. 160.) But that which mostly concerns us on this subject, is the testimony of Bar-Salibi, which is unobjectionable. He wrote illustrations on the books of the New Testament and on the Gospels, by name. In the preface, he cites by name the authors from whom he has extracted his expositions, at the head of whom stands Ephræm (Ass. § ii. p. 157, 158.) But, in the preface to Mark, he assures us, a second time, that these Commentaries were composed on Tatian's Monotessaron (T. i. p. 57.) The Commentaries of Ephræm, therefore, were not merely superficially known to him, or from the report of others, but from frequent use, so that he is perfectly qualified to pass a decision upon them.

Apostles. He proceeds, "their head and leader, Tatian, accomplished a connection and conjunction of the Gospels, I know not how, and called it the Gospel by four, which is still found in the possession of some [c]. So far the historian."

Yet, what he means by the LAW, PROPHETS, and GOSPELS, or the term GOSPELS, or what his age, whose sentiments he speaks, thought of them, is indeed neither obscure nor difficult to be ascertained; in fact, it is as little so as that which he meant by the ACTS OF THE APOSTLES and PAUL. It therefore very clearly appears from whence this Diatessaron was compiled.

Two things, however, must be separately considered in his account—the information itself and its authority. He says, Tatian made a compilation of the Gospels which he called the Gospel by four (Diatessaron) which book is still in existence: thus far the information goes. But he confesses with his accustomed historical honesty, that he was ignorant of the mode of procedure which he observed in this compilation. Consequently, Eusebius does not even represent himself as surety for the fact of which he speaks, but only calls those to mind who were still in possession of the book, or who had seen it, and through whom he had arrived at the knowledge of the fact.

According to these, therefore, to whose communication the historiographer had nothing to object, a book of Tatian was in existence in the fourth century,

[c] L. iv. Hist. Eccl. Cap. penult. χρωνται μεν οὖν οὗτοι νομῳ και προφηταις, και εὐαγγελιοις ἰδιως ἑρμηνευοντες των ἱερων τα νοημματα γραφων. Βλασφημουντες δε Παυλον τον Ἀποστολον, ἀθετουσιν αὐτου τας ἐπιστολας μηδε τας πραξεις των Ἀποστολων καταδεχομενοι. Συναφειαν τινα και συναγωγην, οὐκ οἶδ' ὁπως, των Εὐαγγελιων συνθεις, τὸ διὰ Τεσσαρων τουτο προσωνομασεν, ὁ και παρα τισιν εἰσετι νυν φερεται.

which in a compilation of its own preserved the Gospels then received, and gave to them the name δια τεσσαρων.

I know not what we might still desire in addition, to the knowledge of the circumstance, or to its credibility, unless it were, that one of the eye-witnesses had immediately asserted it. But such an one is not wanting to us. He to whom we here refer, had collected no less than two hundred copies of it.

And this is Theodoret of Cyrus in Syria. This Tatian (says he) has compiled the Gospel, which is called Diatessaron, but he rejected from it the genealogies and other passages, which represent our Saviour as sprung from the race of David, according to the flesh.

He characterizes the book according to its contents, but retains the *terminus comparationis*, in the sense, according to the agreement or disagreement with which, he wished to make its contents known to his readers. From whence did he therefore conceive that he had rejected the Genealogies? From what writings was he of opinion that Tatian had omitted some passages? from what books, which were known to his readers, was the Diatessaron distinguished by these criteria?

The ellipsis is by no means difficult to be supplied. Even if we should not call to mind the books of Theodoret which had Genealogies,—what the Syrians mention as component parts of the Diatessaron,—what Eusebius says on the subject, nevertheless we would presume, that Theodoret wished to compare the Diatessaron with his own Gospels, which he read, or with those of others of his communion, to whom he was writing. Since this is the whole difficulty, and the only one in which his account is confused; we readily perceive what he intends to say.

The Diatessaron, therefore, was a harmony of the four Gospels, as Theodoret, and those of his faith, the Catholic Church, possessed them; with this difference, that the Genealogies of Matthew and Luke were wanting to them, as well as some other passages and expressions, which declared our Lord to have been a descendant of David, according to human generation.

He now proceeds to describe himself as an eye-witness of the fact of which he speaks: not only (says he) all Tatian's followers made use of this book but also many of the orthodox[a]. I myself found more than two hundred of these books, which were honourably esteemed in our churches, which I collected and brought away, and in the place of which I introduced the four Gospels.

How literally in other respects this book has expressed the text of the four Evangelists we may conclude from careful reference being made to it for a critical judgment on certain various readings. A Scholion of Codex Harleian, 5647. (Wetstein, 72.) on Matt. xxvii. 49, where after σωσων αὐτον in some MSS. as for instance BCL., the following words occur, ἀλλος λαβων λογχην, ἠνυξεν αὐτου την πλευραν, και ἐξηλθεν ὑδωρ και αἱμα, justifies this reading on the authority of Tatian, and says, that το καθ' ἱστοριαν εὐαγγελιον or his Gospel arranged according to the succession of historical events contained this addition, ὁτι εἰς το καθ' ἱστοριαν Ἐναγγελιον Διοδωρου και Τατιανου, και ἀλλων διαφορων ἁγιων πατερων τουτο προσκειται. κ. τ. λ.

[a] Theod. Hæret. fab. l. i. c. 10. οὑτος (ὁ Τατιανος) και το δια Τεσσαρων καλουμενον συντεθεικεν εὐαγγελιον, και τας γενεαλογιας περικοψας και τα ἀλλα, ὁσα ἐκ σπερματος Δαβιδ κατα σαρκα γεγενημενον τον Κυριον δεικνυσιν.... Ἑυρον δε κἀγω πλειους ἡ διακοσιους βιβλους τοιαυτας ἐν ταις παρ ἡμιν ἐκκλησιας τετιμημενας, και πασας συναγαγων ἀπεθεμην, και τα των Τεσσαρων εὐαγγελιων ἀντεισηγαγον εὐαγγελια.

With Tatian's doctrinal opinions those of Julius Cassian have a close affinity. Some fragments of one of his works περι ἐγκρατειας, ἡ περι εὐνουχιας are preserved in Clemens Alexandrinus [e].

He also rejectcd marriage, recommended continence, and asserted that Paul himself derived the origin of this connection from Eve's temptation. The passage to which he refers is, φοβουμαι δε μη, ὡς ὁ ὀφις Ἐναν ἐξηπατησεν, φθαρῃ τα νοηματα ὑμων ἀπο της ἁπλοτητος της εἰς τον Χριστον [f]. This is verbo tenùs, allowing for casual differences, in the second Epistle to the Corinthians. The office of generation, he is of opinion, is only for carnal men, but not adapted to the exalted ideas of Christians. He quotes, in support of his assertion: ἡμων δε το πολιτευμα ἐν οὐρανῳ, ἐξ οὐ και σωτηρα ἀπεκδεχομεθα. The passage is in Philip. iii. 20, with this difference, that he omits the word ὑπαρχει. We do not perceive from the fragment, as it has been hastily and without connection preserved in Clemens, to which writer Cassian attributes this passage. Yet we can infer from the following expressions of Clemens, that it must be Paul to whom he assigns it; for he continues, αὐδις τε, ὁταν ἐφῃ, and in refutation of it adduces a passage of Paul [g]. On the testimony of Jerome he has likewise misapplied the words of Paul, Galat. vi. 8, *(quoniàm qui seminat in carne suâ,* &c. as far as *vitam æternam)* as authority against the matrimonial contract [h].

[e] Lib. iii. Strom. c. 13, 14, 15. Ed. Ven. T. I. opp. p. 552-54. Sylburg. p. 465. f. He speaks also of a first book των ἐξηγητικων by him, L. I. Strom. c. 21.

[f] L. iii, Strom. c. 14.

[g] Ibid. c. 14 and 15.

[h] Hieronym. Comm. in Ep. ad Gal. L. iii. c. 6. v. 8. quoniam qui seminat.... vitam æternam. Cassianus (some read also Tatianus) qui quotativam Christi carnem introducens omnem conjunctionem

Besides particular evidences for the Gospel of Matthew and John, Tatian therefore, in his Diatessaron, yields a proof of the existence of the four Gospels according to their full contents, with the exception of the genealogies and those passages which relate to the human descent of our Saviour, also of that of the first Epistle to the Corinthians with the name of Paul. But Cassian, by nominal reference, yields proof of that of the second Epistle to the Corinthians; and, as it seems, by nominal citations, of the Epistles to the Galatians and Philippians.

THEODOTUS.

After the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, we find a treatise entitled ἐκ των Θεοδοτου και της ἀνατολικης καλουμενης διδασκαλιας κατα τους Οὐαλεντινου χρονους ἐπιτομαι. It has escaped, together with the other writings of this Father, the vicissitudes of time, and was considered as an essay written by him, to which circumstance it probably owes its preservation[1].

If this were a writing of Clemens, we must be very grateful to him for the trouble, which he has therein taken in making extracts from the writings

masculi ad fœminam immundam arbitratur, Encratitarum vel acerrimus hæresiarches, tali adversùm nos sub occasione præsentis testimonii usus est argumento, si quis seminat in carne, de carne metet corruptionem.

[1] This treatise also appears in the first Greek edition of the Fathers at Florence, 1550, fol., and it was again printed in the following editions, but it was first translated by Combesis the Dominican. Fabricius afterwards incorporated the translation together with the Greek text in the 5th vol. of the Bibliotheca Græca. The translator, who was in other respects a learned man, appears to have sometimes been wanting in the knowledge of facts necessary to this difficult task.

of Theodotus; yet, I account it the labour of a Theodotian, who being desirous of making for himself some excerpta from the essays of his præceptor, principally selected those passages, in which Theodotus brought his doctrinal opinions into comparison with those of the Valentinians.

At §. 2. he places the dogma of Valentinus in a parallel with that of Theodotus, and unfolds his ideas of the LOGOS, MONOGENES, PROTOGENES, &c. (*as far as* §. 8.) We however, ἡμεις δε (he says against him) assert, that the LOGOS is in identity A GOD in GOD; that he was—*i. e.* in power of idea, in the lap of the Father, which lap first revealed the Saviour σωτηρ. That from this power of idea the πρωτοτοκος or first born originally existed δι' ἐνεργειαν, as well as the MONOGENES or only begotten, who is identified with him, and through whose power the σωτηρ acquired his efficacy. Again, there was not only one, but there were manifold religions, just as in the spiritual world there are not the same bodies, and on this account not the same intelligences. Moreover the spirits, even the PROTOKTISTÆ, and finally MONOGENES himself is not entirely without form and body, &c.—§. 8 and 9.

At a glance, where the author freely expresses his dogmata (ἡμεις δε, *but we*, from §. 8. to §. 17. and even still further on) it is evident, that he belongs to a Gnostic persuasion.

Having here placed one part against the other of the theory of the Valentinians as to the human existence, and as asserting a mixture of two different spiritual beings in an unity, he, on the other hand, sensibly remarks (ἐμοι δε δοκει)—spiritual beings associate not according to essence, but through indications of power, they flow not into one another, but exist in one another (§. 17.); from whence he explains

his opinions on the union of that which is supra-mundane with man, developing them fully in §. 8. This controversial question he concludes with an exposition of Ps. cx. 3. where he adds ἡμεις ουτως ἐξακουομεν. §. 20.

As he every where announces himself a determined Gnostic, so is he also an equally determined adversary of the Valentinians, whilst he is positively detailing the dogmata of Theodotus.

In his critical examination of the Valentinians, he makes use (§. 24.) of the harsh expression, ἀγνοουσι, and (§. 30.) calls their doctrines atheistical, λεγουσιν ἀθεως, showing on the other hand, how rightly Theodotus thought on this subject. In this place, ου γαρ συνεπαθησεν ὁ πατηρ must be read, as Sylburgius has proposed, rightly to understand the passage.

Greatly as he declares himself for this teacher at §. 33. he however, departs from his theory, but he continues to say "*Our Theodotus*," by which he again names the school to which he is attached. The manner in which he contradicts him is so gentle, that we do not perceive its point: ἐστιν ουν ὁ λογος ουτος παρακουσμα του ἡμετερου :—"it is either a miscomprehension of our author, or it is incorrectly related."

This obscure, and in many respects difficult work, is therefore the essay of a Gnostic, and indeed of a Theodotian, written with a polemical object against the dogmata of Valentinus. From its arrangement and form, it appears only to contain aphorisms from a greater Gnostical production. The inscription very correctly therefore announces the work :—"Extracts from the Writings of Theodotus against Valentinus :" only, I think, that for κατα τους Ουαλεντινου χρονους we should read Ουαλεντινου κοινωνους. Theodotus hardly lived in the days of Valentinus, in which case alone

χρονους could have a meaning: others have consequently proposed the word αἰωνας.

Thus far is the case stated; and we may now avail ourselves of the benefit, which probably may result from these writings.

For the sake of establishing the difference between supramundane natures and the different classes of the spiritual state, Theodotus asserts, that in no being of the seven orders of spirits do such exalted properties meet as in the Son. Whence, he remarks, και ὁ μεν φως ἀπροσιτον εἰρηται ἁ ὀφθαλμος οὐκ εἰδε, και οὐς οὐκ ἠκουσεν οὐδεϑ ἐπι καρδιαν ἀνϑρωπου ἀνεβη[k]. The first part of the passage appears to allude to 1 Tim. vi. 16. ὁ μονος.... φως οἰκων ἀπροσιτον, the second is found literally in 1 Cor. ii. 9. Although he does not name the author, nor mention the sacred books from whence he has extracted the words, yet he makes use of the expression εἰρηται,—a form which he only employs, when he quotes any thing from the Old Testament or the New, as in §. 54. or §. 19. §. 42. as Tatian also used it under similar circumstances.

These various spirits, in part, derive their differentia from the comparatively purer or grosser bodies, with which they are surrounded. Therefore, also, if I may be allowed to retain the expression, even souls, ψυχαι, have a *corpus animale*, whence the Apostle says, ὁ γουν Ἀποστολος.... σπειρεται μεν γαρ σωμα ψυχικον, ἐγειρεται σωμα πνευματικον. After some parentheses, he cites the words ὡς δε ἐφορεσαμεν την εἰκονα του χοϊκου, φορεσομεν και την εἰκονα τον ἐπουρανιου, and remarks on it, πλην παλιν εἰκονα λεγει: *moreover, he calls it again an image.* After inserting a trivial conclusion, he observes, και παλιν; *and again,* ἀρτι βλεπομεν δι' ἐσοπτρου ἐν αἰνιγματι, τοτε δε προσωπον προς

[k] §. 10. p. 970. Ven. Edit. et Ed. Sylburg. p. 790.

προσωπον. (§. 14. §. 15.) These repetitions *(again and again)* must refer, according to the order of things, to the first citation, ὁ ἀποστολος, *the Apostle says*. And the three quotations actually exist in the Apostle's first Epistle to the Corinthians, xv. 44. 49. and xiii. 12. Also §. 22. και ὁταν εἰπῃ ὁ Ἀποστολος, ἐπει τι ποιησουσιν οἱ βαπτιζομενοι ὑπερ των νεκρων, are the words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 29., and he calls him by his name in §. 44. "PAUL (says he) *orders*, Παυλος κελευει τας γυναικας φερειν ἐξουσιαν ἐπι της κεφαλης, δια τους ἀγγελους; excepting the substitution of φερειν for ἐχειν, the passage is accurately taken from 1 Cor. xi. 10.

As spirits differ in matter, so do they also in intelligence. The protokistæ, archangels, and angels, are dissimilar in the degree of knowledge. This he proves thus: εἰς ἁ ἐπιθυμουσιν ἀγγελοι παρακυψαι, ὁ Πετρος φησιν; and still further, κατα τον ἀποστολον, τιμιῳ και αμωμῳ και ἀσπιλῳ αἱματι ἐλυτρωθημεν, §. 12. He names Peter, and the passage is in 1 Pet. i. 12. he then says, *according to* THE APOSTLE, and the passage again is in 1 Pet. i. 19. with a slight variation; yet is it expressed in a manner free from doubt and easy to be recognized.

For a similar Gnostical dogma, which we have neither time nor space here to consider diffusely, he claims the authority of Paul: και ὁ Παυλος, ἐνδυσαι τον καινον ἀνθρωπον, τον κατα Θεον κτισθεντα. In another place he still more clearly asserts this: και ἐτι σαφεστερον και διαῤῥηδην ἐν ἀλλοις λεγει· ὁς ἐστιν εἰκων του Θεου του ἀορατου, εἰτα ἐπιφερει Πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως. Thence he concludes, that of him these words are said, ὡδην και μορφην δουλον λαβειν εἰρηται, §. 19. The two first passages are thus in Paul (Ephes. iv. 24. and Coloss. i. 18.), the last is only cited under the form εἰρηται, and merely consists of few words, which may be recognised in Philip. ii. 7.

At the separation of the elements, the Demiurgus formed the genera of evil spirits from the gross matter, to which λυπη, the mother of evil in the world belongs: this the Apostle is said to imply where he says, διο και λεγει ὁ Ἀποστολος, και μη λυπειτε το πνευμα το ἁγιον του Θεου, ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγισθητε. These are Paul's words (Eph. iv. 30.).

Much, however, succeeded indifferently with the Demiurgus, principally from ignorance, since he left nature to herself, not understanding how he should guide her. The Apostle asserts this: δια τουτο εἰπεν ὁ Ἀποστολος, ὑπεταγη τῃ ματαιοτητι του κοσμου οὐκ ἑκων, ἀλλα δια τον ὑποταξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπιδι, ὁτι και αὐτος ἐλευθερωθησεται, §. 49. This is cited with some small variations, or perhaps freely and from memory; yet, beyond doubt, it was taken from Rom. viii. 20, 21.

Hence also is that struggle in creation, of which Paul speaks, εἰπεν και ὁ Παυλος, νομον ἀντιστρατευομενον τῳ νομῳ του νοος μου, §. 52. So says Paul, Rom. vii. 23.

But Adam, besides that which he, like each creature, had received out of the whole, had also received, by means of the angels, the seeds of superior wisdom. For this reason (so the author proceeds) *he says*, φησι. This phrase can only be referred to the writer before quoted, who is Paul. The words which he unites in this form of citation are, διαταγεις, φησι, δι' ἀγγελων, ἐν χειρι μεσιτου· ὁ δε μεσιτης ἑνος οὐκ ἐστιν, ὁ δε Θεος εἰς ἐστιν, §. 53. These are exactly so in the Epistle to the Galatians, iii. 19, 20.

Now Jesus, to commence the redemption of the world, abandons the πληρωμα, which is opposed to the κενον, as the Apostle asserts, ὡς λεγει ὁ Ἀποστολος ἑαυτον κενωσας, §. 35. This expression is in Philipp. ii. 7. Elsewhere, Theodotus has availed himself of the rest of this passage, as we have already observed, ὁθεν και μορφην δουλου λαβειν ἐιρηται, §. 19.

He has quoted from this Epistle, without expressly appealing to a Biblical book, in connection with other passages, which are borrowed from Paul (Colos. i. 16. and Ephes. iv. 9, 10), the following clauses, although somewhat freely: διο και ὁ Θεος αὐτον ὑπερυψωσεν, και ἐδωκεν αὐτῳ ὀνομα το ὑπερ παν ὀνομα, ἱνα παν γονυ καμψῃ και πασα γλωσσα ἐξομολογησηται, ὁτι Κυριος της δοξης Ἰησους Χριστος, §. 43, and Philipp. ii. 9, 10, 11.

The epitomizer of Theodotus has referred in different places to the allegories of our Saviour, but so briefly and hastily, that we readily perceive that he presupposes all this perfectly known: he also observes a similar conduct in the historical narratives which relate to our Saviour. We, indeed, retrace all these things in our Gospels: but since, in their execution and diction, they retain no individual reference to our books, it were over-hasty to conclude that they must directly have originated from them.

Thus he appeals to a discourse of our Saviour, σωτηρ φησι, wherein he speaks of one who had returned from a journey, after having consumed all his property, in celebration of whose return a fatted calf was killed; cf. Luke xv. 11—23. Or of a king, who had prepared a wedding-feast, to which he had invited the people from the highway. Matt. xxii. 2—9, Luke xiv. 16—23, (§. 9). Yet the narrative approaches nearest to St. Matthew, because he is a βασιλευς, and calls his banquet δειπνον του γαμου, which is not the case in Luke. He also mentions a history of Lazarus and a rich man; whence he shews, that even after the present life, we have a body and members, s. 14. cf. Luke xvi. 19, &c.; as well as an exhortation of our Saviour (παραινει ὁ σωτηρ), wherein he intrusts us to bind the strong man before we take possession of his armour (§. 52. cf. Matt. xii. 29, Mark iii. 27, Luke xi. 22). In the two first the ex-

pression almost literally occurs. Or §. 86, where he speaks of virgins, of whom some were prudent (παρθενοι φρονιμοι); but others were imprudent, and were not on that account admitted, Matt. xxv. 1, &c.

He has treated historical events with a similar brevity, *e. g.* the arrival of the Magi, who saw the star of our Saviour, and thence perceived that a king was born, §. 75. Or how a coin was brought to our Saviour, and he inquired, τινος ἡ εἰκων και ἡ ἐπιγραφη, (§. 86,) which accords with Matt. xxii. 20, and Mark xii. 15, and a little with Luke xx. 24; and how our Lord was glorified on the mountain before Peter, James, and John, and how they heard a voice from heaven, §. 4, 5.

At this last occurrence, Matthew makes use of a simile, xvii. 2. και ἐλαμψε το προσωπον αὐτου ὡς ὁ ἡλιος, και τα ἱματια αὐτου ἐγενετο λευκα, ὡς το φως, which occurs neither in Mark (ix. 3.) nor in Luke (ix. 28.) This simile, however, Theodotus combines with a Biblical citation, which he ascribes to one of the Apostles, κατα τον Ἀποστολον, for he remarks on it, "how difficult it is to look at the Son of God." The citation is in 1 Pet. i. 19. with which he immediately connects it, οὐ μεν τα ἱματια ὡς φως ἐλαμψεν, το προσωπον δε, ὡς ὁ ἡλιος, §. 12. Here we approach nearer to Matthew; it is the same figure, and even the same expressions, especially as the word ἐγενετο is wanting in some MSS. of the Evangelist.

He often quotes freely from memory, or interweaves the words of the author with his own. Thus, §. 52., our Saviour says, ὁ σωτηρ λεγει;—φοβεισθαι δειν τον δυναμενον ταυτην την ψυχην και τουτο το σωμα ψυχικον ἐν γεεννῃ ἀπολεσαι. The passage, as to its purport, and partly as to its words, is in Matt. x. 28. He moreover quotes it likewise in another place, §. 14. φοβηθητε (γουν λεγει) τον μετα θανατον δυναμενον και ψυχην

και σωμα εις γεενναν εμβαλειν. If from the first citation we may draw the inference to this, it is undeniably from Matthew. Here he says—γουν λεγει—to whom does he refer this? Immediately before, he had made use of the expression, ὁ γουν Ἀποστολος, and having concluded this citation, and his own inference, he continues, γουν λεγει. It is therefore an Apostle who so speaks.

With the phrase, ὁταν οὐν ειπῃ ὁ κυριος, he connects the following passages, μη καταφρονησητε ἑνος των μικρων τουτων. Ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν, τουτων οἱ ἀγγελοι το προσωπον του πατρος δια παντος βλεπουσι, and μακαριοι οἱ καθαροι τῃ καρδιᾳ, ὁτι αὐτοι Θεον ὀψονται, §. 11. The first of these passages is with merely a slight transposition, as to the words in Matthew xviii. 10. Ἐν οὐρανοις after ἀγγελοι αὐτων, are wanting, in this place, as in all the ancient fathers, translations, and MSS. The other passage is *verbo tenùs* in Matt. v. 8.

Our Lord goes after his baptism into the desert, where he was among the wild beasts and was attended by angels, §. 85. The circumstance that he lived μετα θηριων with wild beasts, or the figure, with which he adorns the picture of the desert, is only in Mark i. 13.—that he was attended by angels, is only in Mark and Matthew.

Our Lord brought peace on the earth, as says the Apostle, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ἀποστολος, §. 73. This Apostle is Luke; in him the words occur: εἰρηνη ἐπι της γης, και δοξα ἐν ὑψιστοις, ii. 14.

The quotation, §. 60., το πνευμα ἁγιον ἐπελευσεται ἐπι σε (την του σωματος του κυριου λεγει μορφωσιν) δυναμις δε ὑψιστου ἐπισκιασει σοι verbally agrees with Luke i. 35. That he quotes a writer in whom this is read, we perceive from the parenthesis. Yet we can neither conclude from the preceding nor subsequent parts, the name or quality of the writer.

we have before seen, §. 60., has explained to express nothing more than the formation of the human body by God, in which he afterwards took his seat. There is a form of citation in the Epitome about it, viz. λεγει, which does not define who speaks it. Yet even this is wanting in Epiphanius.

Next, he informs us of another reasoning of the Heretic. "The Apostles, (says Theodotus), called him merely a man proved true by signs and wonders," (ἀλλα, φησιν, εἰπον, οἱ Ἀποστολοι····) The words which he quotes, are in Acts ii. 22. He does not indeed say, the Acts of the Apostles, but οἱ Ἀποστολοι called him such, &c. But that the Acts of the Apostles are intended by this form of citation, we perceive in Epiphanius, who thus cites them against him in return: "these same Apostles say in the Acts, as St. Stephen expresses himself," &c. παλιν οἱ αὐτοι Ἀποστολοι ἐν ταις πραξεσιν ἐφησαν, ὡς ὁ μακαριος Στεφανος φησιν, ἰδου ὁρω····Acts vii. 56. It was indeed only Peter, who there speaks in Acts ii. 22.—the phrase οἱ Ἀποστολοι is not adapted to him: it must, therefore, relate to the book in which this is narrated.

He thought, that he had discovered in the Epistles another pretext for his opinion. "The Apostle (says he) calls Jesus a mediator between God and man:" παλιν δε προφασιζεται λεγων, ὁτι ἐφη περι αὐτου ὁ Ἀποστολος, ὁτι Μεσιτης Θεου και ἀνθρωπων, ἀνθρωπος Χριστος Ἰησους, κ. τ. λ. These words are in 1 Tim. ii. 5 [m].

Theodotus endeavours again to establish this from John viii. 40., where our Lord thus expresses himself, ὁτι, φησιν, ὁ Κυριος ἐφη, νῦν δε ζητειτε, κ. τ. λ [n].

That some would even dare deny Christianity, he

[m] Loc. c. p. 467.

[n] L. c. p. 463.

proves from Matt. xii. 31., αὐτου, φησι, του Χριστου εἰποντος, πασα βλασφημια, κ. τ. λ°.

Before we part from Theodotus, we would once for all call to mind the books for which we have found proofs in him. Among Paul's Epistles, those quoted under the form εἰρηται, are 1 Corinthians, Philippians, 1 Timothy:—those under the name of the Apostles, or with that of Paul, are Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians.

The first of Peter, once with the name, and once with merely the prefix—"the Apostle."

He has in a short and summary way, referred to several allegories of our Lord, and to historical narratives, which exist in our four Gospels. He has cited some of our Saviour's sayings, which both in substance and words are contained in Matthew, Luke, and John. He relates the residence of Jesus in the wilderness after his baptism, merely in general terms, yet with one circumstance, which is only noticed in Mark. Once he quotes Matthew and John, and once also the Gospel of Luke, with the words "the Apostle says."

According to the extracts preserved by Epiphanius, he appeals to passages in Matthew, in Luke, in John:—to the Acts of the Apostles under the title οἱ ἀποστολοι, and lastly to the first Epistle of Timothy, under the term ὁ ἀποστολος.

OF CERTAIN ANONYMOUS HERETICS.

These of whom we would speak, belong to the Heretics of the second century, of whom mention is

[redacted] L. c. p. 464. See plates 1. 2. at the end of the volume.

made in Tertullian and Origen. Their names are unknown, and much less still is known of their writings.

Tertullian says, that some maintained the existence of an exoteric and esoteric sense in Christianity, and asserted, that the Apostles, besides the general doctrine, imparted to their more intimate disciples one more recondite, in which they delivered to them certain peculiar and deeper notions. He observes, that they alleged the proof from Paul, who wrote to Timothy, "Keep that which is committed to thy trust;" and, "O Timothy, that good thing which was committed unto thee, keep;" and also, "what thou hast heard, ...commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also[p]." These passages are in the first Epistle to Timothy vi. 20., and in the second i. 14., ii. 2.

The assertion of these heretics, and the proofs which they produced in their favour, are, indeed, not known to us from their own information, but they yet rest on an historical basis, viz. the communications of Tertullian, who was desirous of instructing and correcting them on these points. They were, probably, the Carpocratians, against whom this Father contended: if so, the assertion in question is a dogma of their school [q].

Precisely the same account occurs in Origen, who complains, that some of them from ignorance of the laws of critical exposition, had fallen into false in-

[p] De Præscriptione, c. 25. Confitentur quidem, nil Apostolos ignorâsse, nec diversa inter se prædicâsse, non tamen volunt illos omnia omnibus revelâsse; "quædam enim palam et universis, quædam et secrete et pancis demandâsse. Quia et hôc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: O Timothee, depositum custodi, et rursum, bonum depositum serva.... Sed, nec quià voluit, illum hæc fidelibus hominibus demandare, qui idonei sunt, alios docere, id quoque argumentum occulti alicujus Evangelii interpretandum est," &c.

[q] Irenæus, l. i. adv. Hæreses c. 25. n. 5.

terpretations. He then observes: "Under which are those to be included, who from the words of John '*the world lieth in wickedness*' (1 Ep. v. 19.) have wandered into abominable doctrines with regard to the Creator[r]." It is well known that the Gnostical school in general considered the Creator as a very imperfect Spirit, who badly understood his work, and consequently introduced evil into the creation. Although we are not rightly informed to which branch of the Gnosis this mode of proof may be principally assigned, it is yet certain, that the first Epistle of John must have then been in existence, since they have founded these doctrines upon it.

MARCION.

Marcion took offence at the many Jewish notions, with which Christianity made its appearance, and which probably his age had not always the ability to separate, as mere vehicles and leading ideas, from the principal matter, to which they were adjoined. These being displeasing to him, he resolved to destroy Judaism in the Christian school. He undertook this, by means of a work which he entitled Antitheses, which was celebrated by the ancients, and respected by his followers as a symbolical book. In this he proved, that the moral precepts of Jesus are directly contrary to those of the

[r] Origenes T. ii. opp. p. 23. Ed. de la Rue. Comment. in Genes. In Ed. Cœll. T. i. p. 16. Imp. Huetii. *οἱτε παρα το ἀγνοεισθαι την ὁμωνυμων της κοσμου προσηγοριας φωνην, ἐκπεπτωκασιν ἐπι τα ἀσεβεστατα φρονειν περι του Δημιουργου, οἱ μη καθαραντες, ἐπι τινων κειται το, ὁ κοσμος ἐν πονηρω κειται, ὁτι ἀντι των περιγειων και ἀνθρωπινων τουτο οὑτως ἐκει τῳ Ιωαννῃ εἰρηται· οἰηθεντες γαρ κοσμον κατ' αὐτην την λεξιν σημαινεσθαι το συστημα το ἐξ οὐρανου και γης και των ἐν αὐτοις, θρασυτατα και ἀνοσιωτατα ἀποφαινονται περι Θεου.*

Old Testament, whence he concluded, that the God of the Jews, who is also the Creator, is by no means to be confounded with that more noble God, whom Jesus announced, and whose Son he was.

An idea of this work is given in the Dialogue against the Marcionites, which is ascribed to Origen[s]: in which one of his followers, without mentioning the source itself, whence they are derived, enumerates in the first section, twelve to eighteen of these Antitheses, the greater part of which, and even some others scattered through the works of Tertullian, are besides found here and there in the Fathers.

Though he may have disclosed a far greater degree of intellect than most of the heretics of these days, he was by no means original in his opinions. Cerdo preceded him in them, as in general in his doctrinal notions, having at a more early period asserted this contradiction between the two Testaments[t]. Some of his Antitheses may still be seen in Theodoret[t], and had he more copiously detailed these instead of epitomizing others, this account of Cerdo would be of great value, since it would enrich us with some admirable proofs of the Gospels.

Yet, it seems, that in this particular Marcion went beyond his master, as he not merely asserted the Antitheses or contradictions of the two Testaments, but admitted particularly into the New, even the Antitheses of the Apostles. For this he found one foundation in the Epistle to the Galatians, and accused Peter and those who were with him of Judaism[u]. He consequently adhered to Paul, and we shall readily perceive, that, however many of them

Irenæus l. ii. adv. Hær. c. 27. Tertullianus passim. Epiph. Hær. xlii.

[t] Theod. Hæret. Fab. l. i. c. 24.

[u] Tertullian. l. i. adv. Marcion. c. 20. l. iv. c. 3. l. v. c. 2.

he may have had, he was not particularly biassed in favour of the writings of the other Apostles. Of them he received no more than one Gospel, and the Epistles of Paul, but not all of them.

Those which were directed to individuals, to Titus and Timothy, were excluded from his collection of Paul's Epistles; he only granted a place in it to that to Philemon. The Epistle to the Hebrews was also rejected, so that he had in all only ten Epistles of Paul. This collection was then called Apostolicon.

He arranged them also in his Codex, otherwise than they now stand in our books, or formerly stood. To that to the Galatians he assigned the first rank: then came the first and second Epistle to the Corinthians; next, that to the Romans, the two to the Thessalonians, that to the Laodiceans, to the Colossians, to Philemon; the last was that to the Philippians [x]. The Epistle inscribed to the Laodiceans, was (as it is well known) that to the Ephesians, as Tertullian declares, and as surviving extracts from it prove.

In this order the Epistles follow each other in Epiphanius and Tertullian. This Father in his fifth book against Marcion, engaged to refute him from those books, which the heretic himself acknowledged, and he commences his task with the Epistle to the Galatians, and proceeds with it, through the second, third, and fourth chapters. From the fifth to the eleventh chapter he goes through the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and from the eleventh to the thirteenth, the second. The thirteenth and four-

[x] Epiph. Hær. xlii. p. 158. Basil. Αἱ δε ἐπιστολαι αἱ παρ αὐτῳ λεγομεναι εἰσι πρωτη μεν προς Γαλατας, δευτερα δε προς Κορινθιους, τριτη προς Κορινθιους δευτερα, τεταρτη προς Ῥωμαιους, πεμπτη προς Θεσσαλονικεις, ἑκτη προς Θεσσαλονικεις δευτερα, ἑβδομη προς Ἐφεσιους, ὀγδοη προς Κολοσσαεις, ἐνναται προς Φιλημονα, δεκατη προς Φιλιππησιους.

teenth chapters are devoted to the Epistle to the Romans, the fifteenth and sixteenth to the two to the Thessalonians, the seventeenth and eighteenth to that to the Ephesians or Laodiceans, the nineteenth to that to the Colossians, the twentieth to that to the Philippians, the twenty-first, finally, to that to Philemon. With respect to this last Epistle alone, Tertullian and Epiphanius differ.

Tertullian follows him from passage to passage; at first, with great care, but afterwards he attempts to be more brief. Epiphanius also has noted for us several observations on his text, and collected various readings from his copies, in which he differed from the codex of the Cyprian bishop; the author of the Dialogue against the Marcionites has likewise imparted to us, occasionally, similar remarks.

If we examine quietly all these—their strong and often precipitate objections,—it cannot be contradicted, that the Epistles of Paul inserted by Marcion in his collection, on the whole, and in general, corresponded with those of the orthodox, and that the point of contention is only relative to particular passages, not to the whole. Marcion is therefore beyond doubt, a distinguished witness for the writings of this Apostle, and the charges against his Apostolicon are not directed against the contents of the Epistles themselves, but simply against a different recension of them.

Now, as the Evangelical Codex of Tatian, excepting the secondary dispute concerning the Genealogies and some other points, authenticates the existence of our Gospels in the mass, in like manner, for the ten Epistles of Paul, the Apostolical Codex of Marcion is a historical document, which its antiquity confirms, and also, adjudges to that author, to whom it is commonly attributed.

The Gospel, also, which he possessed, was according to the unanimous account of the ancients, that of Luke. This is still further confirmed by the extracts which Tertullian, the author of the Dialogue against Marcion, and especially Epiphanius, have given, the last of whom collated, as well the Epistles, as the Gospel of Marcion with the Catholic copies then in use, and also marked the variations in particular readings.

Yet in this, as also in the Epistles, the ancients upbraided him with having omitted and altered much, and with having mutilated the Gospel of Luke. It appears really to have been the case; but they frequently did him injustice, and blamed him for alterations, which were only various readings, which again appear in other orthodox teachers and other MSS.

But Marcion did not allow this reproach to rest upon him, but returned the complaint, asserting, in the antitheses, that the Gospel, which his opponents exhibit, had been falsified by persons attached to Judaism, in favour of their opinions [y].

We cannot now inquire which of the two is right; but we must not entirely omit another question, viz. what were the intentions with which he recommended his Gospel to his followers? Whether he would have his text considered as the original and uncorrupted, which had thus descended to him from antiquity? or, whether he would have it considered

[y] L. iv. adv. Marcion. c. 4. Si enim id Evangelium, quod Lucæ fertur, penes nos viderimus, an et penes Marcionem, ipsum est, quod per Antitheses suas arguit, et interpolatum à protectoribus Judaismi ad incorporationem Legis et Prophetarum, quo etiàm Christum inde confingerent? Dialog. contra Marcion. § ii. p. 63. Ed. Wetstenii. τουτο οἱ Ἰουδαϊσται ἐγραψαν. p. 54. ταις Ἰουδαϊκαις φωναις οὐ πειθομαι.

as one purified from additions, as an emended and critical edition?

From himself we have no accurate information on this subject; yet, it was by no means known to the ancients, that he represented his text as the original, which had thus descended to him from the days of the Apostles. Tertullian rather assails the other position with violence and impetuosity.

As the Fathers of the Church state the case, Marcion conceived grounds from Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, to distinguish among the Apostles themselves a party inclined to Judaism, and a party opposed to it. Hence, he conceived, that he had found a sufficient reason for discarding the other Gospels, and ascribing a current value only to his own. Consequently, Tertullian inquires, if the Apostles themselves in any way had falsified the Gospel, how, in later times, could Paul and his pupil Luke have attained the knowledge of the true Gospel? But, if false Apostles had introduced interpolations, who can now say among such a manifold corruption, where a genuine apostolical document exists? Or is that only a genuine one, which Marcion has?

This last question he now leaves perfectly at rest, since it does not belong to the doctrinal speculations and reveries of Marcion, and labours alone with all his power, for the sake of rendering his credit, as an emendator, doubtful, to prove that no emendation was necessary, that his was a rash and daring attempt, that he was no emendator, and his book no amended edition[s].

[s] L. iv. adv. Marcion c. 3. c. 4. Emendator sanè Evangelii à Tiberianis usque ad Antonia tempora eversi Marcion solus et primus obvenit, expectatus tamdiù à Christo pœnitente jàm, quod Apostolis præmisisse properâsset sine præsidio Marcionis, nisi quod humanæ temeritatis, non divinæ Auctoritatis negotium est hæresis, quæ sic

Marcion, therefore, could not have categorically explained himself on this subject, or even have asserted the contrary to that, of which some of the moderns so confidently assure themselves, viz.—that he had received from ancient times, an original Gospel in the state in which he delivered it to his school; and that he circulated this in the state in which he had received it, among his followers.

Origen also supposes it to have been the common opinion, that Marcion aimed at the credit of a critic and emendator. According to which idea, he rejoins that a malicious person having interpolated one of his own writings, and apologised for having done so, he became desirous of expurgating them; and indeed he did expurgate them, but in the manner that Marcion expurgated the Gospels [a].

Since even his disciples considered it as an emendation, they continued after his example to exercise their critical talents upon it, and (as the author of the dialogue against Marcion observes) even now entirely to corrupt what he had left untouched [b]. Tertullian therefore counsels them, wherever they make an alteration, in consequence of meeting with a difficulty, only to make their alterations in future after the Catholic copies [c].

semper emendat Evangelia, dum vitiat:—itaque dum emendat, utrumque confirmat, et nostrum alterius, id emendans quod invenit; et id posterius, quod de nostri emendatione constituens suum fecit. With regard to the other Gospels, he says of him, c. 5. in quantum ergò emendasset, quæ fuissent emendanda, si fuissent corrupta, in tantum confirmavit non fuisse corrupta, quæ non putavit emendanda. Denique emendavit, quod corruptum existimavit. Sed nec hoc merito, quia non fuit corruptum re.

[a] Epist. ad Alexandrin. in Apolog. Ruffin. pro Origen. Videte quali purgatione disputationem nostram purgavit, quali purgatione Marcion Evangelia purgavit. Cf. in initio.

[b] §. v. 174. Ed. Wetstein.

[c] L. iv. adv. Marcion. c. 5.

If we may draw a conclusion from the Epistles to the Gospel, it assuredly appears that he took great delight in a species of higher criticism, which he employed subserviently to his own views. Then it will necessarily follow, that he was in possession of the original Epistles.

PTOLOMÆUS AND HERACLEON.

Irenæus joins them together, and therefore appears to have accounted them contemporaries: nevertheless, he places Ptolemy before Heracleon [d]. Tertullian also follows the same order: his words are, "Valentinus marked out the road, Ptolemy paved it, and Heracleon made the bye-path [e]. But this last was, according to Origen [f], Οὐαλεντινου γνωριμος: he enjoyed the acquaintance or instruction of Valentinus:—which Ptolemy also enjoyed in a much greater degree. Cerdo, the instructor of Marcion, was contemporary with them, but he belonged to a different sect. Epiphanius, indeed, places him, according to the time in which he came into notice, after Heracleon [g]: nor can the intermediate period, which he by chance omits, possibly be of importance, since Cerdo was still distinguishing himself under Hyginus, under whom Valentinus rose to the head of a separate school [h].

We have still one Epistle of Ptolemy to Flora his pupil [i], in which he instructs her concerning the

[d] Iren. L. ii. adv. Hæreses. c. 2.

[e] Tertull. adv. Valentinianos. c. 4.

[f] Orig. T. ii. in Joann. p. 60. Huet. Colon.

[g] Epiphan. Hær. XLI. Κερδων τις τουτους και τον Ἡρακλεωνα διαδεχεται.

[h] Iren. L. iii. adv. Hær. c. 4.

[i] Epiph. Hær. xxxiii.

opposition of the law and the Gospel, which then, through Cerdo, had become the subject of discussion, and cautions her against the pernicious maxims which some deduced from this antithesis: viz. that the God of the Old Testament is to be distinguished from the God of the New, and that the former was the God of the Jews, Creator of the world, and merely an imperfect God.

For the Apostle expressly declares the Saviour to be the Creator of the world when he, ὁ Ἀποστολος, says, παντα δι αὐτον γεγονεναι, και χωρις αὐτου γεγονεναι οὐδεν. This Apostle is evidently John, i. 3. But those who interpret the words of our Saviour, τα ὑπο του σωτηρος εἰρημενα . . . οἰκια ἡ πολις μερισθεισα ἐφ' ἑαυτην, ὑτι μη δυναται στηναι, of the Jewish lawgiver, and of an imperfect constitution, of which he is the author, do not understand our Lord. The first part of this is in Matt. xii. 25, with the variation ἐφ' ἑαυτην, as we read it in Codex D:—οὐ δυναται σταθηναι, or, as BLK and some others read it, οὐ δυναται στηναι, is in Mark iii. 25. Yet, the coincidence in the two concluding words may even be accidental, and the whole may be a quotation from memory.

All the laws of the Old Testament proceed not from God himself; some are merely from Moses, as our Saviour, διαλεγομενος που ὁ Σωτηρ, says to those, who inquired of him respecting a bill of divorce: ὁτι Μωϋσης προς την σκληροκαρδιαν ὑμων ἐπετρεψε το ἀπολυειν την γυναικα αὐτου, ἀπ' ἀρχης οὐ γεγονεν οὑτως (Θεος γαρ, φησι, συνεζευξε ταυτην την συζυγιαν) και ὁ συνεζευξε ὁ Κυριος, ἀνθρωπος μη χωριζετω. The first part of this, as far as the parenthesis, where the Valentinian has inserted one of his own remarks in his ordinary style of speaking, are, with the exception of insignificant variations, in Matt. xix. 8, and in no other Evangelist: ὁτι Μωσης προς την σκληροκαρδιαν ὑμων ἐπετρεψεν

ὑμιν ἀπολυσαι τας γυναικας ὑμων, ἀπ' ἀρχης οὐ γεγονεν οὑτω̃ς, cf. Mark x. 5, 6. The conclusion is also in Matthew: ὁ οὐν ὁ Θεος συνεζευξεν, ἀνθρωπος μη χωριζετω, xix. 6. The words are indeed actually in our Evangelist, in the connexion, in which Ptolemy has cited them, and are besides, including the formula, the Lord says, much assimilated to a quotation by means of the phrase διαλεγομενος που. For example, Clemens Romanus has pointed out also a passage in Isaiah with the same phrase, λεγει γαρ που, and another likewise with the same words in the Proverbs of Solomon. Clem. Ep. 1. ad Cor. c. 15 and 21.

Be these however as they may, he again informs his pupil, that human ordinances may even have been mixed with the law, as the Redeemer declares, δηλοι και τουτο ὁ σωτηρ. Moreover, he makes a quotation, in which, although it be free and memoritèr, Matthew is forcibly expressed. The beginning τιμᾱ̃ τον πατερα σου και την μητερα σου, ἱνα εὐ σοι γενηται, is as much from Moses as from Matthew. *Yet ye say*, our Lord observes to the teachers of the law, δωρον τῳ Θεῳ, ὁ ἐαν ὠφεληθης ἐξ ἐμου, which is, except the addition of τῳ Θεῳ in Matthew, as well as the following, και ἠκυρωσατε τον νομον (so read Codices C. 13, 124.) του Θεου δια την παραδοσιν των πρεσβυτερων ὑμων: the words also of Isaiah, which Matthew has very properly treated, viz. ὁ λαος οὑτος, as far as ἐνταλματα ἀνθρωπων, are taken from Matthew xv. 5, 6, 8.

We may consider the law in general, he proceeds to say, under three points of view. One part of it the Redeemer has fulfilled: it is that νομος, ὀν οὐκ ἠλθε καταλυσαι ἀλλα πληρωσαι (Matt. v. 17), that part which he came to fulfil, not to destroy. Another part has been abolished, and the third was only figurative,—a representation of that which was to come, and ceased, when that took place. For in-

stance, the law—a tooth for a tooth, an eye for an eye, was abolished by the Redeemer, when he said, *εγω γαρ λεγω υμιν, μη ἀντιστηναι ὁλως τῳ πονηρῳ, ἀλλα ἐαν τις σε ῥαπισῃ, στρεψον αὐτῳ και την ἀλλην σιαγονα.* The position of the words in Matt. v. 39, with merely a slight variation, is the same: Codex D also, which in general preserves a very ancient text, omits *δεξιαν.*

Concerning that part, which was to be accounted merely figurative, and to consist in ceremonial observances, Paul is declared to have spoken, (*δηλοι και Παυλος ὁ Ἀποστολος*), when he says *τὸ πασχα ἡμων ἐτυθη Χριστος, και ἱνα ἠτε, φησιν, ἀζυμοι, μη μετεχοντες ζυμης.... ἀλλ' ἠτε νεον φυραμα.* The words are misplaced according to the custom of Ptolemy, and freely given, yet they are evidently those of Paul, 1 Cor. v. 7. Even this Paul, who illustrates the metaphor of the Passover and unleavened bread *ὁ Ἀποστολος Παυλος.... την εἰκονα.... δια του πασχα και των ἀζυμων δειξας*, speaks of that part of the law, which had been abrogated, *εἰπων, τον νομον των ἐντολων ἐν δογμασι κατηργησθαι·* and also of that which only required improvement and completion, *ὁ μεν νομος, εἰπων, ἁγιος, και ἡ ἐντολη ἁγια, και δικαια και ἀγαθη.* The first passage is here freely expressed, and in the infinitive, yet according to the words of Eph. ii. 15. The other is literally from Romans vii. 12.

Of the written labours of Heracleon considerable fragments survive. An exegetical fragment on Luke xii. 8., *πας, ὁς ἐαν ὁμολογησῃ ἐν ἐμοι* as far as *ἀγγελων του Θεου* is preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus, whence he (*τουτον τον τοπον ἐξηγουμενος* [1]) seeks to establish the position, that it is enough for a man to confess Jesus by means of his actions, and to prove

[1] Lib. iv. Strom. c. 9. Ed. Ven. 595. Sylb. 502.

the validity of his precepts by his life, without the addition of an oral confession (probably in persecutions). On this account, our Saviour says ἐν ἐμοι, when he speaks of confession, and με, when he speaks of denial. For, ἐν ἐμοι implies those, who live in him by conviction and doctrine, and in whom he consequently also lives. Under such circumstances the denial were inconceivable: for, then he must have denied himself, which is impossible; διοπερ ἀρνησασθαι ἑαυτον οὐδεποτε δυναται. He seems to lay a stress on these words, as if they were conclusive and parallel to the preceding. Paul also has in the same manner declared them of Jesus himself, as they are here applied, ἀρνησασθαι ἑαυτον οὐ δυναται, 2 Tim. ii. 13.

In an appendix, apud Clementem Alexandrinum, he comments at great length on an apostolical passage (οὑτας ἀκουσαντες το ἀποστολικον [k]) which occurs in Matt. iii. 11, 12.; and in Luke iii. 17. in the very same words. This testimony, therefore, decides in favour of neither of the two in particular.

But the fragments of his commentaries on the Gospel of John are numerous and considerable, which Origen communicates in his expositions of this Gospel, for the sake of convincing and reclaiming the Heretics. Tom. i. in Johan. iii. vi. vii. viii. ix. x. xi. xii. xiii. xiv. xv. xvi. xvii. xviii. xix. xxi. xxiv. xxvi [l].

Sometimes Heracleon has taken notice of other

[k] Ex Scriptis Prophetarum Eclogæ. c. 25.

[l] They are extracted from the works of Origen by Grabe (Spicileg. Patr. v. ii. p. 85—117.) According to the edition of De la Rue, Opp. Orig. v. iv. Comment. in Joh. Tom. i. p. 66. 73. T. vi. p. 102. 117. 120—22. 125. 130. 138—40. 157. T. x. p. 170. 179. 194. 196. 200—2. T. xiii. 220—21. 224—227. 229. 230. 234. 235. 237—239. 241. 242. 248. 251—52. 255. 256. 260—263. 265—67. 274. 275. 276. 277. T. xix. p. 296. 302. T. xx. p. 316. 332. 337—40. 345. 359. 360.

Biblical passages, in the course of his expositions. Yet he has merely treated them briefly, and rather alluded to them, than expressly quoted them; and often he has only inserted them into the thread of his discourse according to their meaning.

He explains in his own peculiar way the history of the nobleman or soldier in John iv. 46. (Origen, T. xviii. in Joann.) and understands the Demiurgus by βασιλικος. From which interpretation, he remarks by implication, that in the passage, οἱ υἱοι της βασιλειας ἐξελευσονται εἰς το σκοτος το ἐξωτερον, the destruction, which impends over the creatures of the Demiurgus, is [m] intended. The passage is in Matt. viii. 12., with the mere variation of ἐξελευσονται, which exists in Bianchini (Cod. Veron. et Vercell.)

Elsewhere (Tom. xvi. in Joann.) he refers, with the formulary κατα το, to the words, ὁ θερισμος πολυς, οἱ δε ἐργαται ὀλιγοι. And among other Biblical citations (Tom. xiv.) he says, that the Son came ζητησαι και σωσαι το ἀπωλολος. The passages are literally in Matt. ix. 3., and xviii. 11., but they are also in Luke x. 2., xix. 10. Therefore his words decide in favour of neither.

In the course of the dissertation (T. xiii.) he manifestly inserts the words of 1 Cor. xiii. 12. without literally quoting them, or even treating them, as a citation. He connects with them the words ἀῤῥητα ῥηματα ἁ οὐκ ἐξον ἀνθρωποις λαλησαι, which are peculiar to the second Epistle to the Corinthians (xii. 4.) [n] He then refers (T. xiv. in Joann.) on account of the expression, λογικη λατρεια, to the Apostle, καθ' ὁ και ὁ ἀποστολος διδασκει. This occurs in Paul's Epistle to the Romans xii. 1 [o].

[m] According to the Edition of De la Rue, T. xiii. p. 76.
[n] T. xiii. p. 220.
[o] T. xiii. p. 234.

We have therefore the following testimonies out of the remains of Ptolemy and Heracleon. In the former, we have five passages extracted from the Gospel of Matthew, which are partly literally correct, partly moderately so, but always such, as may not be easily mistaken;—one from the Gospel of John, not entirely literal, but with the reference, ὁ ἀποστολος. We have testimonies with the name of Paul from the Epistle to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, and that to the Ephesians. In Heracleon we have fragments of a commentary on the whole of John, an exposition of a passage from Luke, a passage from Matthew, with a form of citation: besides which a reference to the Epistle to the Romans, with the adjunct ὁ ἀποστολος, and without any intimation that they are quotations, a passage loosely but manifestly extracted from the first Epistle to the Corinthians, one verbally correct from the second Epistle to the Corinthians, and from the second to Timothy.

VALENTINUS AND HIS SCHOOL.

Ptolemy and Heracleon were disciples of Valentinus; but they abandoned his school, and separated themselves from his doctrines in particular points. Yet he continued, notwithstanding their secession, the head of a great and very extended school, which took its name from him.

We still possess some remains of his works, viz. fragments of his Epistles, of his Homilies, and of a treatise concerning the origin of evil [p]. But in

[p] Apud Clem. Alex. L. iii. Strom. L. ii. L. iv. Origen dialog. contra Marcion, Sect. iv. Grabe Spicileg. Pat. and Hær. v. ii. p. 50—58.

these fragments which have been merely extracted to elucidate some of his peculiar ideas, no proofs of the sacred books occur, and as to our purpose, they may as well not have survived.

Yet Irenæus has considered the Biblical arguments, with which he defended his religious doctrines, worthy of his attention, and places his own refutations in array against them, by means of which they have come to our knowledge.

He had intercourse, as he says, with the Valentinians [q]—probably he had the writings of the School of Valentinus before him, upon which he founded his labours. We indeed hear the preceptor from the mouth of the pupil, yet here we obtain no minute description of his religious doctrines, excepting only in such particulars as fall within the compass of every day's remarks.

It is especially worthy of notice, that the Fathers of the Church did not assail him, as a corruptor of the Biblical writings, or as one who rejected and retained what he pleased. Tertullian indeed concedes this far to him, that he received the Biblical codex entire; but he reprobates him for having by means of his misinterpretations caused to it a greater injury than the knife of Marcion [r]. Irenæus relates, that Valentinus gave the preference to the Gospel of John: but he takes umbrage at him and his followers, respecting the other Gospels, merely on this account, that in addition to the four acknowledged Gospels, he had one more than other Christians, which his school even called EVANGELIUM VERITATIS [s]. As to the rest, he says, that they not only

[q] L. i. adv. Hær. Præf. n. 2. ἐντυχον τοις ὑπομνημασι των, ὡς αὐτοι λεγουσι, Ὀυαλεντινου μαθητων.

[r] Tertull. de Præscript. Hæret. c. 38.

[s] Iren. Lib. iii. c. ii. n. 7. adv. Hær.

take their proofs from the Evangelical and Apostolical writings, and support them afterwards by expositions and artful interpretations, but that they even take them from the law and the Prophets [1].

Hence we might draw an advantageous conclusion for the whole of the Canonical books, as they were received in the days of Irenæus and Tertullian, but we would first of all see how these general and unsuspected assertions were confirmed, as to particulars in favor of the heretics; then it will be free for every one to appreciate the accumulated testimony.

This father quotes the parables and narratives of the historical books of the New Testament, from which they framed their proofs, not according to their whole scope, as they might have stated them in their writings. It is, therefore, especially necessary, that we should more accurately inform ourselves, from the proofs and conclusions which they thence deduce, whether their arguments have such a particularity in the circumstantial detail or language, where they take notice of them, as really to induce the supposition, that they sufficiently make known and individualize our historical records.

They refer among the rest to that parable of our Saviour, on which they would ground the number of their thirty Æones. Probably, by reason of its diffusiveness, it was not quoted word for word:—it is the parable of the labourers who at different hours were sent into the vineyard. According to the narrative, they were sent at the first, the third, and the sixth, some at the ninth, others at the eleventh hour.

[1] Iren. L. i. c. iii. n. 6. *και οὐ μονον ἐκ των εὐαγγελικων και των ἀποστολικων πειρωνται τας ἀποδειξεις ποιεισθαι, παρατρεποντες τας ἑρμηνειας, και ῥαδιουργουντες τας ἐξηγησεις, ἀλλα και ἐκ νομου και προφητων.*

Now these hours, one, three, six, nine, and eleven make up the number thirty: hence, originated the thirty Horæ or Æones [u].

A parable of labourers in a vineyard is in Matthew xx. 1. But is it the same as that on which they founded their opinions? In the description it is a mere matter of chance, which hours, and how many are named: it had been sufficient if he had said, in general terms, at different hours, or in the morning, noon, and evening. But in Matthew the labourers are sent πρωϊ, or μιᾳ ὡρᾳ, v. 12.—about the first, the third, the sixth, the ninth and eleventh hour: exactly as they state it. Were there a variation in any one hour, their argument would lose its application. It therefore places before us the narrative of Matthew in the whole circumstantial detail, which is perfectly accidental, and depends on the writer's mode of narrating it: whence, Irenæus infers—thus, they abused the sacred writings, &c.

The account of the woman, who had suffered from a discharge of blood for twelve years, according to its description and particulars, as the Valentinians cite it, is not in Matthew. But, is it probably so described in Mark or Luke? Mark v. 25. Luke viii. 43.

Her case in the words of Mark is thus given, παθουσα δωδεκα ἐτη, and they rest their argument as much upon παθουσα, as upon δωδεκα ἐτη. For they would from thence teach, that one of their spiritual natures, the twelfth Æon, had endured great suffering, and had been cured by another power, (την ἰασιν του πεπονθοτος αἰωνος), and that ἡ παθουσα δωδεκα ἐτη ἐκεινη ἡ δυναμις is here represented. When the woman touched Jesus, he inquired, τις μου ἡψατο; as the words occur

[u] Iren. L. i. c. i. n. 3.

in Mark v. 30. They proceed to say, that by this question, he wished to instruct his disciples; διδασκοντα τους μαθητας occurs only in Mark, where the disciples also enter into the conversation: και ἐλεγον οἱ μαθηται—κ. τ. λ. [x]

The history of one Anna, who is mentioned in the Gospel, και δια της Ἀννης της ἐν τῳ Εὐαγγελιῳ κηρυσσομενης προφητιδος· who was a prophetess, and had lived seven years with her husband, and spent the rest of her time in widowhood, until the advent of our Saviour, is in every point briefly told in the Gospel of Luke, ii. 36. Or the account of one Simeon, who gave thanks, and took our Saviour in his arms, saying, νυν ἀπολυεις τον δουλον σου, δεσποτα, κατα το ῥημα σου ἐν εἰρηνῃ· which represents the Demiurgus, who perceived and anticipated his near departure, at the advent of our Saviour. This history, with these circumstances and words of Simeon, is in the same Evangelist, ii. 29 [y].

But they appeal by name to John, the disciple of our Lord, as having expressly mentioned the first eight Æones. In proof of which, they adduce the first chapter of his Gospel, which they interpret in their own way. Irenæus here quotes their own expressions [z]. "John the disciple of the Lord, wishing to describe the formation of the universe, as the Father sent forth each part from himself, places first ἀρχην the principle, which he also calls μονογενης and Θεος, in which the Father created the root of every thing,

[x] Iren. L. i. c. iii. n. 3.

[y] Iren. L. i. c. viii. n. 4.

[z] Iren. L. i. c. viii. n. 5. ἐτι τε Ἰωαννην τον μαθητην του Κυριου διδασκουσι την πρωτην ὀγδοαδα μεμηνυκεναι αὐταις λεξεσιν λεγοντες, οὑτως Ἰωαννης ὁ μαθητης του κυριου βουλομενος εἰπειν την ὁλων γενεσιν, καθ'ἣν τα παντα προεβαλεν ὁ πατηρ, ἀρχην τινα ὑποτιθεται, κ. τ. λ.

ϑρωπων. The passage is in Matt. v. 16 [c]. They explain likewise, the passage: εἰσι τινες των ὡδε ἑστηκοτων, οἱ οὐ μη γευσονται ϑανατου, ἑως ἀν ἰδωσι τον υἱον του ἀνϑρωπου ἐν δοξῃ, not as relating to the Apostles, who were standing round him, but to the things of the universe which surrounded our Saviour [d]. The whole words are in Matthew as far as ἐν δοξῃ, which variation, however, also occurs in MSS., and some of the ancient versions, Matt. xvi. 28. This citation, as far as the last words, is likewise in Mark ix. 1. and Luke ix. 27. It would, therefore, be very uncertain to conclude any thing from hence, in favour of Matthew exclusively. This quotation has been extracted here, less for this purpose, than for another, viz. to make us observe, that the testimonies for particular Gospels are not therefore so numerous as we probably wish them to be, since often a passage quoted exists in other Evangelists with equal harmony, which especially is the case in Matthew and Mark.

Paul is said to have spoken of those higher spirits, which they call Æones, τον Παυλον τους δε αἰωνας ὀνομαζειν, for he said, εἰς πασας τας γενεας του αἰωνος των αἰωνων. The words are in the Epistle to the Ephesians iii. 21 [e].

All these Æones have brought together all that each of them in particular possessed, and have united them in one individual being, whence Jesus or the Saviour came into existence. Consequently Paul calls him, all in all: ὑπο δε Παυλου φανερως δια τουτο εἰρησϑαι λεγουσι, and adduce as proof Rom. xi. 36., and especially Coloss. ii. 9. ἐν αὐτῳ κατοικει παν το πληρωμα της Θεοτητος, and also, a passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians

[c] Epitome ex Scriptis Theodoti § 2.
[d] Lib. cit. § 4.
[e] Iren. L. i. c. iii. n. 1.

κους, ψυχικους, πνευματικους. In proof of the correctness of this classification, they quote Paul among others. Παυλον διαῤῥηδην εἰρηκεναι χοϊκους, ψυχικους, πνευματικους. The assertion of the Apostle, which they quote, is in 1 Cor. xv. 48. and 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15. They then adduce the passage in Rom. xi. 16., appealing to him by name, Παυλον εἰρηκεναι .

They have thus quoted in all, from the Epistle to the Romans, from the first to the Corinthians, from that to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians.

We find among the curiosities of the British Museum (Cod. Ἀσκεω-quære 'Ayscough'), a work of Valentinus πιστη σοφια, translated into the dialect of Upper Ægypt. If we may judge from the characters, this MS. is the oldest book in the Coptic language. Woide has consulted it in his edition of the Sahidic New Testament, yet only in those places where the πιστη σοφια deviates in considerable variations, or supplies chasms. Besides which, we find a great number of passages from the four Gospels and several of the Epistles noticed. If the work described a larger circle of the opinions of the learned world, besides these explanations of which we now speak, it would afford to us still many others.

THE EBIONITES

were always opposed to the Apostle Paul, whose anti-judaical sentiments, as may easily be supposed, were necessarily obnoxious to them. Consequently, they had their own Acts of the Apostles, in which James was the principal person, which favoured their Jewish prejudices to the extent which they desired. This production was composed against Paul, not

[k] Iren. L. i. c. viii. n. 3.

without false assumptions, for they even deprived him of his Jewish origin, in proof of which they referred to his own confession. As the writer, who has made known to us the contents of this book, says, they founded their pretext on this passage—I am a native of Tarsus, a citizen of no mean city [l]. The words are in our Acts of the Apostles, in c. xxi. 39.

BASILIDES AND ISIDORUS

were father and son, both men of letters, and chiefs of a Gnostic school. Several important fragments of the writings of the son have been preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus. They, however, rather exhibit the dogmata of this individual, than the grounds on which he defended them [m].

In one of these fragments he treats of marriage and celibacy. When the Apostles (so he commences it) inquired of our Saviour whether it were not better not to marry, he is recorded to have said, οὐ παντες χωρουσι τον λογον τουτον. Jesus spake these words (as they here stand) in Matt. xix. 11. in the connection there mentioned, after the Disciples had objected, if it be so it would be better not to marry at all. Our Saviour still further adds, there are eunuchs from their birth, and eunuchs by compulsion; but

[l] Epiph. Hær. xxxx. n. 16. Πραξεις δε ἀλλας καλουσιν Ἀποστολων εἰναι.... ἀναβαθμους γαρ τινας και ὑφηγησεις δηθεν ἐν τοις ἀναβαθμοις Ἰακωβου ὑποτιθενται, ὡς ἐξηγουμενον κατα τε τον ναον και των θυσιων,.... ὡς και του Παυλου ἐνταυθα κατηγορουντες·.... Ταρσεα γαρ αὐτον, ὡς αὐτος ὁμολογει και οὐκ ἀρνειται, λεγοντες· ἐξ Ἑλληνων δε αὐτον ὑποτιθενται, λαβοντες την προφασιν, ἐκ του τοπου δια το φιλαληθες ὑπ' αὐτου ῥηθεν, ὁτι Ταρσενς εἰμι, οὐκ ἀσημου πολεως πολιτης. κ. τ. λ.

[m] Lib. I. Strom. L. ii. l. iii. and l. vi.

those who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the everlasting kingdom, &c. &c. Of these three sorts of eunuchs our Saviour speaks in this passage of St. Matthew, and the last part of the passage (however freely it be otherwise treated) approaches also closely to Matthew: οἱ δε ἑνεκα της αἰωνιου βασιλειας εὐνουχισαντες ἑαυτους [n].—Matt. xix. 12. οἵτινες εὐνουχισαν ἑαυτους δια την βασιλειαν των οὐρανων. The connection, the matter, and, in part, the expression, point to Matthew.

He acts with equal freedom in another citation, in which he appeals to the Apostle: λεγειν τον Ἀποστολον —ἀμεινον γαμησαι ἢ πυρουσθαι. This is easily recognizable in 1 Cor. vii. 9. κρεισσον γαρ ἐστι γαμησαι ἢ πυρουσθαι [o].

Epiphanes, the son of Carpocrates, of whose writings some few remains have also [p] reached us, attacks the doctrine of Isidorus concerning the Law, and charges him with not having understood the words of the Apostle: μη συνειν το του Ἀποστολου ῥητον, λεγοντος—δια νομου την ἁμαρτιαν ἐγνων. The passage is in Rom. vii. 7.

Very little indeed has survived of his father Basilides, although Agrippa Castor was acquainted with twenty-four books written by him on the Gospel [q]. This loss is not insignificant, since he appeared as an instructor under Hadrian, (and probably even under Trajan) and closed his days under Antoninus Pius, in whose reign others first began to attract notice [r].

In the greater fragment of him, the following

[n] Lib. iii. Strom. c. 1. Epiphanius adv. Hæres. l. ii. xxxii. p. 211. ed. Petav. Colon. p. 95. ed. Basil.

[o] Lib. iii. Strom. loc. cit.

[p] Lib. iii. Strom. c. 2. Grabe Spicil. Patr. T. ii. p. 61, 62.

[q] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 7.

[r] Grabe Spicileg. T. ii. p. 36, 37.

passage seems to me remarkable: ἀλλα ἐξ ἀλλων ὀντως ἐγκαλουμενοι, ἱνα μη ὡς καταδικοι ἐπι κακοις ὁμολογουμενοις παθωσι· μηδε λοιδορουμενοι ὡς ὁ μοιχος, ἡ ὁ φονευς, ἀλλ' ὁτι Χριστιανοι πεφυκοτες, ὁπερ αὐτους παρηγορησεν, μηδε πασχειν δοκειν[s]. This passage, as to its matter and sentiment, is in the first Epistle of Peter, iv. 14, 15, 16. and is certainly distinguished in some parts. The following proximity of expression exists between them: ἱνα μη ὡς καταδικοι ἐπι κακοις ὁμολογουμενοις παθωσι, μηδε... ὡς ὁ φονευς. Peter also expresses himself, μη γαρ τις ὑμων πασχετω ὡς ὁ φονευς... ἡ κακοποιος, and ἀλλ' ὁτι Χριστιανοι πεφυκοτες—κ. τ. λ. Peter says, εἰ δε ὡς Χριστιανος, μη αἰσχυνεσθω.

Origen has communicated also to us, in his commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, a fragment from the writings of Basilides, in which he interprets the words of Paul (Rom. vii. 9, 10.) by one of his favourite dogmata, the wanderings of souls: a very unlucky explanation indeed, as we may easily perceive, yet still not without penetration and acuteness[t].

But we find so many testimonies in the second century, and even in the scanty remains of a literature, in which the love of destruction was active with a fixed purpose, yet with the happiest results, that no one of those books, which were free from doubts in the orthodox Church, was published with-

[s] Clem. Alex. l. iv. Strom. c. 12. Sylburg. p. 506.

[t] Origen, l. v. comment. in Epist. ad Rom. l. 5. Tom. ii. Opp. Lat. edit. Basil. p. 530. Ego, inquit (Paulus), mortuus sum; cœpit enim jam mihi reputari peccatum. Sed hæc Basilides non advertens de lege naturali debere intelligi, ad ineptias et impias fabulas sermonem Apostolicum traxit in Pythagoricum dogma... dixit enim, inquit Apostolus, quia ego vivebam sine lege aliquando, hoc est antequam in istud corpus venirem, in eam corporis speciem vixi, quæ sub lege non esset, pecudis scilicet vel avis, &c. Edit. de la Rue V. iv. p. 549.

out security. We must only except the Epistle to Titus: this has remained unauthenticated; yet the Gospel of John and of Matthew, the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and that to the Romans, and other books, are supplied for the testimonies far beyond what they require to substantiate them. We may imagine how brilliantly the external proofs might be restored, if, where it was determined to destroy, some small part alone was preserved.

If, however, for some passages the testimonies be weaker, let those be joined to them which have been collected from the Fathers, and the two conflicting parties, which were never of accord during their lives, Fathers of the Church and Heretics, will mutually assist each other in erecting one glorious monument of truth.

It is yet still worthy of our more particular attention, that these accidentally preserved testimonies not merely attest the existence of the writings of the New Testament in the second century, but that they also answer for an earlier origin of these works. There are few of them which confine themselves to their own space of time, which do not ascend higher, and even assure us that the Apostles composed these writings, and that Peter, John, and Paul, were their authors.

CHAPTER II.

REMARKS RELATIVE TO THE CREDIBILITY OF THESE WRITINGS.

SECTION IX.

COMMONLY, when a person believes himself to have demonstrated the authenticity of these books, he then enters on an inquiry into their credibility. With regard to the didactic writings, this question cannot be so far allowed, since they point back to events. Yet, since nearly all the occurrences to which they refer, are contained in the historical books, they are plainly confined to the peculiar historical memoirs of the New Testament. But are the facts true which these impart to us?

It appears to me, that a question of this extent is here proposed too early, since we are by no means yet informed of the historical character of the writers, of their sources, and relation to each other. The answer can only be a result of many other and deeper inquiries, of which we must first await the issue.

Yet, what has been effected on this subject by learned men, by Less and Paley, is well known; but it is in the power of no extract to contradict the extent of these pages, even if it were of the same date.

There are however cases, in which the conclusion is perfectly right, that these books are authentic, and therefore are credible. What we could easily conclude from the premises, OUR BOOKS ARE AU-

THENTIC, is not contrary to the order of things, and may here desire its proper place.

When I consider the character of the man, who is described in the Gospels, I find him great and noble in such a high point of view, as no Jewish head could have invented. The tranquil, quiet greatness of the philosopher, in whose heart lofty plans, unnoticed, arrive at maturity, who, surrounded by the lowest and most ordinary circumstances, advances merely from internal powers to the highest nobility of soul, projects a moral regeneration of his species, undertakes the purification of all ethical knowledge, resigns it unshaken to the execution of that for which he places his life in pledge, and actually lays it down, regardless of the ignominy with which it is taken away; such a Regulus for the moral improvement of men is for mere Jews, at this period of the national decay, far too fine a conception.

But, then, the manner in which this character is conducted through all situations, among offences and plots, in the midst of snares, among friends and enemies, is so unique, that no philosopher could have more beautifully depicted the life of a philosopher. Dignity and conscious recollection every where accompanies him, and in each scene of his life, his conduct with respect to things, time, and persons, is ever the most suitable, and considered in each point of view, also the noblest. So he appears at first, and so he continues through all difficulties and events to the end of his life, the same,—a character, which in itself exhibits a high moral cultivation,—expressing in his behaviour the architype of that moral system, which he was desirous of introducing to mankind. To assert and maintain such a character through all the circumstances of life, is not a drama-

tical proposition for the creative imaginations of common and uneducated Jews.

Of this nature are his pure and lofty conceptions of religion and morality, his luminous elevation above Judaism, his extensive insight into the regulations of moral nature and its condition, far above this and the earlier ages, and above the genius of that whole nation, among whom he appeared as an isolated phœnomenon.

When Plato and Xenophon depicted the character of Socrates, and described it so good, that no mortal might readily approach this picture of the wise and moral man, we may suppose that they added ideal lineaments, or at least raised the real to the ideal, but these Jews were no Platos. The Jews had no Xenophon and Æschines, they could lend no perfection to their picture, they could communicate little nobility to their object: they could at most give only what they had received, in their unembellished simplicity. He must therefore have so existed, he must so have acted and spoken, otherwise, they would have been unable so to have written.

On the other hand, no objection is urged, but the wonderful manner in which his life was spent. Permit me this incidental remark. For, was not he himself a wonder? We in vain look around us, for any thing in this nation, and the institutions which nourished this blossom, which in so few years matured this genius, which in thirty years produced a Socrates, who excelled the Athenian in his life and death, in the greatness of his views, in the purity of his knowledge and instructions; more especially, as the greatest talents are apt to give way under the influence of prejudice, superstition, authority, the narrowness of contemporaries, and the abject state

of the national intellect. And how long did he labour in this alteration of the world, to prepare which no human life seems sufficiently long? only some few years: he passes by (they are his own words) as a meteor, which in the twinkling of an eye appears in the east, and darts its glimmering to the west. Matt. xxiv. 27.

Thus he himself and the greatest occurrence in the world stand unique in the world's history. How did Christianity spring up in three years? How could it arise in general? Where is the historical chain of this extraordinary event? who has discovered its causes, and its connection with the existing and antecedent worldly occurrences? Let us, therefore, reflect for a little, since both himself and the change, which he proclaimed, are so unique, whether, indeed, where the ordinary course of things has been so very much transgressed, we are authorized in granting to this ordinary course the first claim?

As far as we know the nation, among whom he appeared, it longed for miracles: by means of which every one who proposed alterations or meliorations in affairs of religion, was expected to justify the force of his instructions; they were the condition on which he could exact belief and regard, and calculate on success. But in this consisted the success. He found belief in his native country, where he taught, and a party, without the might, weapons, riches or protection of the great befriending him, like others, without having any thing to aid him but himself. And, notwithstanding he was oppressed and put to death by the co-operation of the public functionaries, when he had scarcely disclosed his moral system, he still found credence after his death, and one so energetic that it shortly extended itself

from his native country, and from the midst of his countrymen throughout the known world. If then the success in his own country was united with this condition, how can we separate the condition from the success?

SECTION X.

The conclusion of the authenticity of the Acts of the Apostles from their credibility is very simple. The Apostles long after the death of Jesus remained exposed to a general observation, and the more the undertaking of their Teacher was known to the world, the more were the eyes of men, through a course of years, fixed upon them. Their history had then become known, as a number of men were scattered through every country, who had seen their conduct and works, and partly continued to see them. How could they consent to the public promulgation of a writing by their co-adjutors, which extolled their perseverance, unless they had exhibited such, which detailed their sufferings and struggles for the sake of Jesus, if the contrary were well known? which notified their actions in this and that place, if no one had known them, and if witnesses could step forwards to disprove them? Could their enemies have invented any thing more detrimental, than by giving a memoir to the world descriptive of deeds, which they were said to have done, if such had not occurred, and if the falsity of them might be substantiated?

CHAPTER III.

WRITING-MATERIALS, EDITIONS, LOSS OF THE AUTOGRAPHA, COLLECTION OF THE BOOKS, AND THE CANON.

SECTION XI.

It is not in vain that we so far extend our researches, and in our inquiries concerning the books of the New Testament, even discuss the materials, on which they were written. On this subject, we shall possibly meet with some doubts, which occur to us, in later times.

It is well know that the ancients wrote with a reed *(calamus)* and ink (of the preparation of which we cannot here speak) on papyrus. It is this last, however, which more nearly concerns us. The quantity of παπυρος, ἀφ' ἡς ὁ χαρτης κατασκευαζεται, which Ægypt produced, and the great price at which it exported the *charta,* rendered the writing-materials of the King of Pergamus very doubtful, as to pre-eminence, so much so that the Romans, at this period, very rarely speak of the *membrana,* and even then, more frequently mean by the expression the bark of plants, the *membrana ex cortice.* The common term of this period is *charta,* χαρτης, 2d Epistle of John, ver. 12.—and sometimes also *papyrus* itself.

The sheets were made from the papyrus-plant, which grew in Ægypt, and more rarely in Syria, and in the neighbourhood of Babylon [a]. The fibrous

[a] Plinius, Hist. Nat. L. xiii. c. 22.

coat of the plant, whence it was prepared, was not uniformly compact and durable; that was formerly accounted the best, from whence the ἱερατικη or paper of the Priests was made, which was appropriated to religious writings and the sacred documents of Ægypt. Augustus gave the preference to one of a finer and more pliable texture, which was sufficient for the Romans to adjudge the first rank to this sort: that of Livia was the second rank, and the Sacerdotal sort at this period held the third.

This continued to the reign of Claudius, who undertook another change in it. The Augustan sort was too thin and frequently was penetrated to the other side; it was therefore merely used in epistolary correspondence; for other memoirs one more durable was selected [x]. Hence, according to the custom of the age, we have to distinguish between these two writing materials in the writings of the New Testament;—one for Epistles—another for historical compositions.

SECTION XII.

The ancients seldom wrote their treatises with their own hand, but dictated them to their freedmen and slaves. These were either ταχυγραφοι, *amanuenses, notarii,* hasty writers, or fair-writers, καλλιγραφοι, *librarii,* or βιβλιογραφοι. The office of these last was to transcribe fairly that, which the former had written hastily and from dictation, they were those, who were obliged to write books and other

[x] Ib. c. 23. 34. Strabo. xvii. p. 800. ἡ δε βελτιων ἡ ἱερατικη.

documents which were intended to be durable[y]. Of the two sorts, those appear to be *ab Epistolis*, which occur in books and on stones. The correctness of the copies was under the care of the *Emendator, Corrector*, ὁ δοκιμαζων τα γεγραμμενα [z].

A great part of the books of the New Testament was dictated after this custom. Paul noted it as a particular circumstance in the Epistle to the Galatians, that he had written it with his own hand, Gal. vi. 11. Besides this, he had not once affixed the salutation with his own hand, until chance occasioned him to do so. 2 Thess. iii. 17., 1 Cor. xvi. 21., Col. iv. 18. The Amanuensis, who wrote the Epistle to the Romans, has mentioned himself therein. Rom. xvi. 22.

But, in every case, historical compositions were required to receive by means of the Calligraphist and the Corrector that last state of perfection, which was necessary to a writing, intended in the form of a book to come into the hands of many readers.

SECTION XIII.

Works of each sort could only be multiplied by means of transcripts. Whenever in this way they passed over to others, they were beyond the control of the author, and published. The edition or publication, by means of the booksellers [a], was, only at a later period, advantageous to the Christians.

[y] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 23. de vitâ Constant. xiv. c. 36. Photius. Cod. 121. 162. Hoeschel. Montfaucon. Palæogr. Græc. Lib. i. c. 5.

[z] Nysseni Epist. in Monument. ineditis Zacagnii. Ep. xii. p. 382.

[a] Martial. L. i. Epigr. 6. Cleric. Ars Critic. P. iii. L. i. c. 2. §. 10, 11.

The *recitatio* preceded the publication, which took place often merely among some few friends, and often with great preparations before many persons, who were invited for that purpose [b]. From hence the author became known as the writer, and the world became previously informed of all which they might expect from the work. If the composition pleased them, he was requested to permit its transcription [c]; and thus, the work left the hands of the author, and belonged to the *Publicum*.

Frequently, an individual sent his literary labours to some illustrious man, as a present, *strena, munusculum;* or he prefixed his name to it, for the sake of giving to him a proof of friendship or regard, by means of this express and particular direction of his work. When it was only thus presented or sent to him, and he accepted it, he was considered as the person bound to introduce it to the world, or as the *patronus libri*, who had pledged himself, as the *patronus personæ* to this duty. It now became his office to provide for its publication by means of transcripts, to facilitate its approach *ad limina potentiorum*, and to be its *defensor*. There are also more allusions of this nature adopted from the Roman law [d].

Thus, the works of the first authors of the Christian school made their appearance before their community. They read the Epistles in those congregations and dioceses to which they were directed, and whoever wished to possess them, either took a tran-

[b] This recitation is expressly described *in dialog. de ordt. c.* 9. at the end of the works of Tacitus.

[c] Juvenal. Sat. iii. 41, 42.

[d] Cf. the inscription of Statius to Melior in the 2d book *Sylvarum*, and to Stella before the first, and to Marcellus before the 4th book. Martial. Epigram. L. xii. c. 3.

script of them, or caused one to be procured for him. The historical works were made known by the authors in the congregations of the Christians, *per recitationem*: the object and general interest in them procured for them readers and transcribers.

Luke always dedicated his writings to an illustrious man of the name of Theophilus. On him was imposed the duty of multiplying the copies, and of distributing them among those who appreciated the worth of such a present, and had stronger claims to his kindness.

SECTION XIV.

These books, when once they had been circulated among the multitude, encountered from thenceforth all that fate which befel in part the learned works of antiquity. Yet, copies of them were always deposited with the Presbyters, which were appointed for the use of the Church, and could serve as authorized documents for the transcription of others [e].

In this respect, the original writings alone had indeed an authority which was exalted far above every objection; hence it might be expected that a peculiar vigilance had taken charge of them, and preserved them for posterity. Nevertheless, we find altogether no certain indications where they were preserved, how long they were seen, or by what chance they were taken away from the world. Moreover, those passages of the ancients, from whom we might expect some account of the autographa, are of a totally different nature.

For instance, Ignatius, the Martyr, thus expresses

[e] Irenæus, Lib. iv. abv. Hær. c. 32. n. 2.

Old Testament, which the Judaizers had the audacity to prefer even to the New.

Now, which ever reading we adopt, τα ἀρχαια, the books of the Old Testament, or ἀρχεια, the cases [f] in which the writings of the Old Testament were preserved in this case, is indifferent, and in elucidation of this passage I am still bound to shew the proof of the interpretation which I have given to the words ὁτι προκειται.

The Judaizers also asserted, that they would not believe the Gospel where it was not written in the Old Testament. When the Martyr replied to them, that it was actually written, they had the impertinence to say, this, however, deserves the preference. Thus I find προκεισθαι in a somewhat rare sense in Sextus Empiricus, Hypoth. l. i. c. 4. ὡς μηδενα μηδενος προκεισθαι των μαχομενων λογων, ὡν πιστοτερον. In the greater Epistles of Ignatius, a passage follows the words here quoted, in which προκεισθαι likewise appears in this sense, οὐ γαρ προκειται τα ἀρχεια τον Πνευματος—the written Law has by no means the preference to that of the Spirit, &c. The interpolation, therefore, here gives to us a justification of the proposed exposition.

Tertullian, on one occasion, appeals to *litteræ authenticæ* of the Apostles, whence some have deemed him to mean the original writing or autograph [g].

But both before and after he speaks of the pure instructions, which might reasonably be expected in those Churches which the Apostles had founded; viz. in those which, for example, possessed Epistles of the Apostles, such as Rome, Corinth, &c. where still their *authenticæ litteræ* were read.

[f] Schmid Historia Canonis. l. i. §. ii. 81. p. 131, 132.

[g] Tertullian de Præscrip. c. 36.

SECTION XV.

We look around us therefore in vain for the originals, in an age when no one knew any thing more about them. They were lost, and we have no one glimpse of the event, by which a property so important to the Church was destroyed. How may we now account for this strange phænomenon?

Probably some of the preceding observations may give us an explanation of this fact. If Paul and his comrades, (to speak first of the Epistles) who at least committed their tractatus with their own hand, to paper; if Tertius, or some one else, *ab Epistolis*, did this, still in general they added the salutation at the end with their own hand. This were sufficient to give to them the value of originals, and to determine a legitimate authority, where heresies arose, relative to the text.

This, however, yields to us no explanation: probably *the materials* may suggest to us something more satisfactory. It was the thin Augustan paper, easily susceptible of injury, on which, after the custom of the times, Epistles were written. Until it had been circulated and frequently transcribed, curiosity, devotion, and application, had caused in it many disfigurations. If such a copy were several times exposed to the like ill usage, we may readily perceive that, with every good intention towards it, it could last but very few years; and even if, under milder treatment, it endured for twenty years, the interval between Nero and Trajan, or that to Severus and Caracalla, had been sufficient to destroy it.

On the other hand, the writing materials for historical works were more durable, and better adapted

what more than forty years before, the same thing happened with the works of the Apostles: a similar exchange of the Epistles of Paul the Church of Laodicea made with the Church at Colosse (Col. iv. 16.)

In this way, Churches distributed to Churches their apostolical documents. This is that, which Tertullian so well remarks against Marcion, who did not shew equal regard to all the Gospels: he says the same documentary authority of those communities, which were founded by the Apostles, testifies also for the other Gospels, which we possess only by means of these Churches and from them [k].

No writings, therefore, could obtain a place in this collection, on whose side the testimony of the communities which had received these Epistles from the Apostles was not, or unless those to whom they had been delivered had received them from them by whom they had been first published.

But if some of them were directed to individuals as the two historical books of Luke, the Epistle to Philemon, the 2nd and 3rd of John, or that to Timothy and Titus, they were friends of the writers, whose testimony is unexceptionable; or they were men furnished with apostolical power of instruction, who were placed over the Churches in which they taught, on account of their credibility.

We might conclude from the assertion of Peter, that the collection of Paul's writings had been completed in his time. For he informs his readers (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.) that his beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom granted to him, had written the same to them, as well as IN ALL HIS EPISTLES in which he speaks of this subject. But the word *all* is here to be limited by the context:—*all*, in which he

[k] Lib. iv. adv. Marc. c. 4.

had touched on this subject, viz. the coming of our Saviour. Yet may we hence perceive, that he conceived his readers in possession of several of St. Paul's Epistles, that they were in wide circulation at that period, and were found in greater numbers in different places.

When, however, several of them had once been written together in serie, the idea of a perfect collection could no longer have been very distant. They had before them one Codex, that of the Old Testament, which suggested the idea of framing one for the New Enactment. The parallel of the two Laws, the καινη and παλαια διαθηκη, which was announced by our Lord, and enlarged by Paul, favoured and called forth such imitations.

This collection was perfected UNDER TRAJAN in those Churches, between which a more intimate union and an interchanging correspondence might be said to exist. They would not otherwise have undertaken a second, by no means in importance to be compared with this, viz. the collection of Ignatius's Epistles, as Polycarp, or the Church at Smyrna and Philippi had done before.

Since this collection merely took its rise from the communication of one Church with another, the distances, or other circumstances, which rendered mutual intercourse difficult, had the unavoidable consequence of causing some more early, and others later, to possess certain Scriptures, and embody them in their Codex. The collections at first must therefore have been different, and must have remained so for a greater or shorter space, according to situations. From this circumstance, as some possessed these treatises later than others, it seems that we may partly clear up the doubts which existed of old against particular books of the New Testament.

SECTION XVII.

THE signal and peculiar preference which was adjudged to them, and the length of time for which they enjoyed exclusive marks of distinction, consisted in the reading of them in the Christian assemblies. As, in the religious meetings of the Jews, this honour was commonly conferred only on the sacred books, the Law, and the Prophets; so with the Christians, including the Old Testament which they had received from the Jews, this eminent prerogative was only conceded to the works of the Apostles. Hence Peter reckons the Epistles of Paul, the author being still alive, among the γραφας, *Scriptures* (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16). And as the Jews designate their books under the general title of Law and Prophets, so the Christians comprehended theirs under the name of Gospels and Apostles, and either placed them in parallel or contrast with each other, νομος, Προφηται, εὐαγγελια και Ἀποστολοι[1].

When these treatises were recognized as γραφη, *Scripture*, and assumed as such the prerogative of being publicly read in the congregations, the collection of them could no longer be delayed, nor could particular books any more be circulated without inspection, or be curtailed, augmented, or altered at pleasure. They were under the protection of the whole community, to which this collection belonged, which was instructed and edified from them.

[1] Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. §. 5. Epistola ad Diognetum, c. xi. εἰτα φοβος νομου φδεται, και προφητων χαρις γινωσκεται, και Εὐαγγελιων πιστις ἱδρυται, και Ἀποστολων παραδοσις φυλασσεται. Justin Mart. Apol. Maj. c. 57. Tertullian de Præscript. c. 36. cf. Apologet. c. 39. Hippolyt. de Christo et Antichristo, §. 58.

On account of this eminent preference, they were called δεδημοσιευμενα βιβλια and δεδημευμεναι γραφαι, *public books, books publicly circulated;* and, on the other hand, those which were not in the hands of the Christians, and were not allowed to be publicly read, were named ἀποκρυφα, ἀποκρυφα βιβλια, *libri secreti* and *absconditi* [m]. We also find, that in opposition to the δεδημευμενα βιβλια, the others were called ἰδιωτικα [n].

An ancient teacher well shews this exclusive prerogative of the apostolical writings, where he speaks of Hermas; we may read him with advantage (says he), yet can we never publish him in the Church among the list of Prophets, nor among the apostolical documents [o].

• The *Canones Apostolorum*, so called, after (can. 84.) having enumerated the sacred books, suggest that

[m] The word ἀποκρυφον, *liber absconditus*, as Augustine expresses himself, is not derived from the critical idiom of the Greeks, but from the Jews, who call such writings גנוזים. Hottinger. Thesaur. philolog. l. ii. c. 2. §. 1. For they were not deposited in the book-chests in which the Scriptures lay, but they were kept in a repository of their own, in secret places. Thus, according to the consent of the learned, Hezekiah *concealed* a book on medicine (Mishnah. Tract. Pesach. c. 4. n. 9.) גנן ספר רפואות והודו לו A Biblical MS. which had three errors in one page, was required to be corrected; if there were four, it was concealed. Gemar. Babyl. Tract. Menachot. c. iii. §. 7. Justin translates it ἀφανες ποιειν. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 120. ἀπο των ὁμολογουμενων μεχρι νυν ὑφ' ὑμων γραφων, he says I have taken proofs, ἀ εἰ ἐνενοηκεισαν οἱ διδασκαλοι ὑμων, εὑ ἰστε, ὁτι ἀφανη ἐπεποιηκεισαν. The first writer, in whom I meet with the word ἀποκρυφος, is Clemens Alexandrinus, l. iii. c. 4. Strom. p. 524. Venet. ἐῤῥυη δε αὐτοις το δογμα ἐκ τινος ἀποκρυφου. The expression is frequent in Origen, and may sometimes be found in Tertullian.

[n] Lambe. Biblioth. Cæs. Vind. T. iii. p. 45, 46. ed. Kollar.

[o] Anonym. apud Muratori. T. iii. Antiq. med. æv. p. 853. et video legi quidèm eum oportet, sed publicare in ecclesiâ populo, neque inter prophetas completum numero, neque inter Apostolos in finem temporum potest.

the constitutions of Clemens should not be published indiscriminately to the world, ἀς οὐ χρη δημοσιευειν ἐπι παντων.

Origen, on Matt. xxvii. 9. declares the same: this is found in none of the commonly received Scriptures (*in publicis Scripturis*, the text here only exists in Latin), in none of those *which are read in the Church or the Synagogue*, but only in the abstruse book of Elias, *in secretis Eliæ* [q].

He remarks in another place respecting the mode of Isaiah's death, that no account of it could be found ἐν τοῖς κοινοις και δεδημοσιευμενοις βιβλιοις, but only ἐν ἀπυκρυφοις [r].

This mark of distinction gave therefore such narrow limits to the collection, that no book could be admitted into it, which did not derive its origin from the fully authorized messengers of Christianity.

SECTION XVIII.

But other arrangements by degrees disturbed this regulation. Particular communities had preserved letters of great and illustrious teachers on memorable occasions, which they carefully read by way of memorial and for edification on appointed days of the year. Thus the Church at Corinth had received a letter from Clemens Romanus, which they in this manner brought to mind from time to time. The case was probably the same with the Epistles of Ignatius in the Churches to which they were directed. By degrees such Epistles were also read in other Churches; so that, for example, the Epistle of

[q] Origenes, v. iii. p. 916. de la Rue.
[r] Ibid. T. x. in Matt. V. iii. p. 465.

Clemens enjoyed in many other Churches this token of public regard [s]. Sometimes this honour even happened to Hermas [t].

Little as this practice might be able to lead astray the judgment of better informed men, yet did it mislead the common people, and even in some cases public instruction; and great care was requisite lest such writings should, thereby, acquire the authority of the books of the Testament. One of our oldest MSS., the Codex Alexandrinus, it is well known, contains also the Epistle of Clemens [u], and the before-mentioned *canones Apostolorum* have reckoned two Epistles of this Father among the sacred books. It was therefore necessary to divide and separate all that time had commenced to admix with them, and to establish certain precautions which might affix a boundary to error. Hence catalogues of the Scriptures arose, to which the name of CANON was given.

I no where find the word in this sense before the third century, where it first appears in the writings of Origen, and only in such passages as existed in the old translation. Towards the end of the prologue to the Song of Solomon, he says, *quæ in Scripturis, quas* CANONICAS *habemus, nusquam legimus, in apocrypho tamen inveniuntur*, and afterwards in that to Matt. xxvii. 9. *hoc in nullo regulari libro* (κανονικῳ) *positum invenimus, nisi in secretis Eliæ* [x].

It became common among the Christian writers in

[s] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. iv. c. 23. ἐν πλείσταις ἐκκλησιαις ἐπι του κοινου δεδημοσιευμενη.

[t] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. iii. c. 3.

[u] This is also the case with some of the oldest Estrangelo MSS. such as that given by Dr. Buchanan to the Public Library at Cambridge.—*Translator.*

[x] Tom. iii. Opp. ed. de la Rue, p. 36, n. 916.

the fourth century, with whom κανων means a rule of faith, and a canonical book is equivalent to a legislative book in religious doctrines. Origen says in the above-mentioned prologue of those which do not belong to the number of these writings, *non admitti ad auctoritatem.* So Jerome declares in his preface to the Proverbs; they cannot be admitted in confirmation of the religious doctrines of the Church, *non admitti ad auctoritatem Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.* Ruffinus closes the canon, which he details in his treatise on the Apostles' Creed, with this observation:—These are the books from whence our Fathers demonstrated their faith. He then proceeds, we may indeed read the books which are not canonical, but we may never adduce them in confirmation of our faith, *non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam.* Athanasius, where he presents us with his catalogue, says that the knowledge which bringeth salvation is alone revealed in the canonical Scriptures; they alone are the sources of the knowledge of redemption [y].

We may here pass by the further significations of κανων, because in reference to the New Testament it is always the rule of faith, and that is canonical which is authorized to express this rule [z].

[y] Athanas. fragm. festal. Epist. Opp. T. ii. ταυτα πηγαι του σωτηριου, ... ἐν τουτοις μονοις το της Εὐσεβειας διδασκαλιον εὐαγγελιζεται.

[z] The other senses of the word may be found in Cave, Dissert. ii. in Append. ad Hist. Litt. Suicer. Thesaur. Philolog. V. κανων. Zonaras in Ep. Imam Canon Basilii et Amphiloch. c. 6.

SECTION XIX.

In my opinion, the oldest catalogue is that of an anonymous writer of the Roman Church, which belongs to the beginning of the third century. Those who would assign to it a higher date, have probably not considered how boldly the author denies the Epistle to the Hebrews; and that the controversy on this point was first decisively turned to his disadvantage by Caius, the Roman Presbyter. Some, indeed, account Gaius, or Caius, himself to have been its author. This catalogue, contains the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the thirteen Epistles of Paul. He accounts that to the Hebrews as the work of an Alexandrian belonging to the sect of Marcion. He then makes mention of the Epistle of Jude, of the two of John, and of his Apocalypse. Yet it seems that he places the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Apocalypse of Peter, among the Christian Scriptures.

His conduct is really singular with regard to Peter. He omits his first Epistle, about which there was no doubt in all antiquity, and instead of it speaks of his Apocalypse. So gross an error cannot be passed by without a closer investigation.

This ancient fragment has come to our hands by means of a barbarous or foreign transcriber, and (as it is very evident) not in its original tongue, but merely in a translation, not nearly so good as that of Irenæus. The Greek text, which was its basis, appears in many places[a]. Supposing this to be the

[a] Muratori Antiq. Ital. Med. æv. T. iii. p. 854. One of these passages is for example: *οὐτως γαρ οὐ μονον θεατην, ἀλλαια ἀκουσ-*

case, we must more attentively consider the words where he speaks of Peter and his Apocalypse. *Epistola sanè* JUDÆ (these are his words) *et superscriptæ* JOHANNIS *duæ in Catholica habentur. Et sapientia ab amicis* SALOMONIS *in honorem ipsius scripta. Apocalypsis etiam* JOHANNIS *et* PETRI *tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in Ecclesiâ nolunt.*

I however conceive, that we must here make some alteration in the stops. *Epistola sanè* JUDÆ *et superscriptæ* JOHANNIS *duæ in Catholica habentur, et sapientia* SALOMONIS *in honorem ipsius scripta, Apocalypsis etiam* JOHANNIS. *Et* PETRI *tantum*, &c.

If we join together *Apocalypsis etiam* JOHANNIS *et* PETRI, I do not see how he could say *tantum recipimus*:—we receive merely two Apocalypses; this was but enough for one of them. Or, if there be a more restricted sense in *tantum recipimus*, it belongs absolutely only to Peter and his Apocalypse, since the more extended observation of *tantum recipimus* shews it merely to refer to the singular number, and only to one, and therefore to the last-mentioned Apocalypse. In this case, a full stop must really be placed after *Apocalypsis etiam* JOHANNIS.

Let us so accept the words, and at the same time turn the incomprehensible *et* PETRI *tantum recipimus* into Greek: και Πετρου μονον παραδεχομεθα. Now, if

'την τε και γραμματεα παντων θαυμασιων του Κυριου καθ' ἑξης ἑαυτον ομολογει. But the most difficult is: Acta autem omnium Apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt Lucas optime Theophile comprehendit, qui sub præsentiâ ejus singula gerebantur, sicut et semotè passionem Petri evidentèr declarat, sed profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis. If we translate it into Greek, it is easy: τας δε πραξεις ἁπαντων των Ἀποστολων γραφεισας εἰς μιαν βιβλον Λουκας τῳ κρατιστῳ Θεοφιλῳ συνεκλεισε, ὁτι κατα μερος ἐν τῃ αὐτου παρουσιᾳ ἐγενηθησαν, καθως, παρεκτος του Πετρου παθηματος σαφως ἐμφανιζει, και της ἐπιδημιας Παυλου ἀπο της πολεως εἰς τας Σπανιας ἐπιδημουντος.

we only change μονον into μονην, we have good sense, and perceive the allusion to the first Epistle of Peter, which is wanting in the catalogue. For he has been speaking of the Catholic Epistles, and now he says και Πετρου μονην παραδεχομεθα; and we receive one alone of Peter. The other clause carries no sense whatever with it, unless it be stated in some such a way, *alteram quidam ex nostris legi in Ecclesiâ nolunt.* If, however, we render it into Greek, we shall soon see how he arrived at his *quam quidam ex nostris,* and on what he founded this interpretation: και Πετρου μονην παραδεχομεθα, ἡς παρεξ τινες ἡμων ἀναγινωσκεσθαι ἐν Ἐκκλησιᾳ οὐ θελουσι. So that we have here, instead of the Apocalypse of Peter, the first Epistle of Peter, as well as the second, the authority of which some controvert.

He omits the Epistle of James, as many of that day did. He admits only two of the Catholic Epistles of John, on which it may be remarked, that (as we shall see in the sequel) he elsewhere finds a trace of the Westerns having presumed merely to consider the second Epistle, as a postscript to the first. If such be really the case, then that, which at present is the third, must have been esteemed by them, as the second.

After this, according to the ancients, the catalogue of Origen held the first rank. It is to be found in his homilies on Joshua, where he allegorically explains the rams-horns at Jericho. "The first, says he, who among the Evangelists blew the rams-horn, was Matthew, then Mark, Luke and John. Peter in his two Epistles, James and Jude did the same. John again began the blast by means of his Epistles and Apocalypse; Luke also in the Acts of the Apostles. But the last was Paul, who, with the fourteen blasts of his Epistles overpowered the sounds

of all. We may compare with this another catalogue of the same writer, which Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. vi. 25.) has preserved to us, wherein he gives us to understand, that the opinions respecting the second of Peter, and the second and third of John were not universally alike, as he has similarly remarked in another place on the Epistle of James.

The Canon of the Syrian Church, which arose from its oldest translation, is at least cotemporary with him. It comprehends the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the fourteen Epistles of Paul: among the Catholic Epistles it receives the Epistle of James, the first of Peter and John, and, as I maintain, also the Apocalypse.

It is worthy of remark, that the Syrians have incorporated the Epistle of James in their version, which does not occur in the Roman catalogue. The influence of geographical circumstances seems to be confirmed in it. Syria must, at a very early period, have known from its situation the pretensions of the Epistle of James, and have been more early and circumstantially informed than any other country, concerning its composer.

SECTION XX.

The history of Eusebius is particularly worthy of our attention, as not merely giving to us as others have done a catalogue of his Church, but as having brought together into one historical picture the public opinions of several Churches, and the individual judgment of the Ecclesiastical writers on particular passages, at one survey.

The principal passage is in the 3d book of his

Church-history, at the 25th chapter, to explain which the 3d and 24th chapters also are useful [b].

He sketches this ground-plan of public and particular opinions on the writings of the New Testament, according to the guidance of Ecclesiastical tradition, κατα την Ἐκκλησιαστικην παραδοσιν, iii. 25. under which he partly understood παραδοσιν ἀγραφον, iii. 39., oral circulation of doctrine; partly, ἐγγραφον, written, and δι' ὑπομνηματων, the communication arising from documents iv. 21. and 37., and finally, also, ἀρχαιου ἐθους παραδοσιν, the tradition of ancient custom, or the truly observed usage of the Church, v. 23, 24.

From which premises he works out his own conclusion, in doing which, he previously notices all that was customary in the Church, ii. 23., iii. 31., and each time quotes the particular ideas of its teachers concerning certain Scriptures from their works, where he especially treats of their circumstances in life, merit, and labours; as he suggested in entering on the chapter, that on this point he only was desirous of producing the testimonies of the ancients transmitted to his time.

The arrangement of the catalogue itself sufficiently

[b] Many learned men guided by different views have laboured to explain this passage; Chr. Fred. Weber—examination of the Section in Eusebius relative to the Canon, in the addenda to the history of the Canon of the New Testament, Tüb. 1791. John Ernst Chr. Schmidt, concerning the Canon of Eusebius, in Henke's Magazine for the philosophy of religion, 5. v. 3. St. Carl Christ. Flatt. on the Canon of Eusebius in the Magazine for Christian Dogmas and Morality, 7th and 8th §. All these Paul Joach. Sigism. Vogel has brought together and criticised; *commentationis de Canone Eusebiano Pars* i. Erlang. 1809. *Pars* ii. 1810. *Pars* iii. 1811. The most recent work on Eusebius's Canon of the New Testament is by Fred. Lücke, Berlin, 1816.

shows this. He promises therein to treat expressly in its proper place of the differences of opinion as to the Apocalypse, which may be here mentioned; he says, that the controverted books were ever (γνωριμα τοις πολλοις,) accounted genuine by many. He notices two sorts of opinions concerning the second and third of John, one party attributing them to the Evangelist, the other to another John: he in like manner refers to the variety of sentiments in those possessing the same religion, respecting the Gospel to the Hebrews. He observes a little further, that notwithstanding this, the controverted Scriptures are known to most teachers in the Church, παρα πλειστοις των ἐκκλησιαστικων γιγνωσκομενας. The expression πλειστοι, ἐκκλησιαστικων, about the meaning of which all are not unanimous [c], is elliptical, and must, as Eusebius points out, relate to ἀνδρων, as in the following passage, των κατα διαδοχας ἐκκλησιαστικων τις ἀνηρ, where we also, perceive, that they are men employed in the office of instruction.

All these declarations being taken together, it is (as we observed at first) not a catalogue of one particular party, but a general picture of the public doctrines and private ideas of the teachers, arranged from many scattered representations of them, according to which, he mustered the books generally recognized, for the sake of giving an historical glance at the different notions, which had existed and continued to exist respecting certain treatises, probably until the great council of Nice. Besides the tradition by documents, if not very extended, is yet

[c] Vogler Comment. de Can. Euseb. pars i. believes ἐκκλησιαστικοι to mean here *Christiani Catholici*, since Eusebius in another place places it in opposition with συγγραφευς. Then, πλειστοι ὁσοι των Ἐκκλησιαστικων, iii. 39. certainly are teachers: even in ii. 25., where Du Valois interprets it *Catholicus, a writer* is intended.

composed of many parts, for which he had before him the written labours of antiquity from Africa and Asia, his native Greece, and even from the Latin Church; whilst, on the contrary, all that he says of Church-usage, must have been taken from a more confined range. The custom of individual Churches, indeed, might less be learned from their writings, than from an attentive observation of the surrounding districts, and acquaintance with the neighbouring teachers; whence the declarations of this nature appear to have relation solely to Asia. So much for the design of the historian, and the aids, which he applied to the execution of his task. Now for his mode of proceeding.

Eusebius has just now spoken of the written labours of the Apostles: then of the Gospels and the writings of John in particular, iii. 24. Encouraged by this, he enumerates the books of the New Testament, of which he had been speaking, τας δηλωθεισας γραφας[d], according to their ancient order.

To illustrate the catalogue, which has thus been completed, we would first of all call to mind the technical language of the ancients in things of this sort, or the ordinary phrases and expressions of Greek critics. They call a genuine work, γνησιον συγγραμμα; they also say, ὁμολογειται αὐτου εἰναι, it is the work of this or that author. Opposed to γνησιον

[d] By δηλωθεισας γραφας, Eusebius merely means the Scriptures of which he had been speaking. Since something more emphatic has been conceived implied by the expression (Vogel. Comm. de Can. Euseb. ps. i. p. 4. Lücke on the Canon of the New Testament, p. 9.) I must substantiate my interpretation. Concerning Josephus's Antiquities before quoted, he thus says, i. 8. ταυτα μεν οὐν ἐν τῃ δηλωθειση γραφῃ, and i. 9. κατα την δηλωθεισαν αὐτου γραφην, and ii. 7., after speaking of Philo's book περι βιου θεωρητικου, he says at the end, This may be perceived ἐκ της δηλωθεισης του ἀνδρος ἱστοριας. iv. 14. ἐν τῃ δηλωθειση γραφῃ, v. 4. ἐν τῃ δηλωθειση γραφῃ, iii. 35. τον δηλωθεντα τροπον, iv. 1. ὁ δηλωθεις Ἐπισκοπος, &c.

are κιβδηλον, ὑποβολιμαιον, νοθον. Between these are the terms ἀμφισβειται, δισταζεται, ἀμφιβαλλεται, as well as ἀμφιδοξειται ὁ διαλογος, ἡ γραφη. By means of these phrases, they mark a division, the parts of which have been given, viz. THE PART WHICH IS DECIDEDLY GENUINE, THE PART WHICH IS DECIDEDLY SPURIOUS, and that, on which THE GENERAL OPINION IS NOT UNANIMOUS. There is no fourth part of this division: but since the Christian school had a peculiar variety of writings, they could not fall under this classification. Origen points out these three gradations, the first of ecclesiastical authors still extant, in whom we meet with a division expressed in the words γνησιον, νοθον, μικτον *, genuine, spurious, and mixed, or that, which some account genuine and others spurious.

Eusebius adopts the customary phrases in the expressions γνησιον or ὁμολογουμενον and νοθον, for the middle member of the division he has chosen ἀντιλεγομενον. According to the preceeding of profane critics and their technicalities, Eusebius recognizes only three gradations or classes, on which no doubt would have existed, had he not shortly afterwards created a confusion in his words or matter. But, let us first examine the catalogue, ere we come to our conclusion.

He distributes all the books, which really belong to the Apostles, or have been supported by their authority, under three titles: ὁμολογουμενα publicly recognized, ἀντιλεγομενα, against which doubts prevail, and νοθα, which have been unduly forced into the catalogue of their works, or might rather have been placed among them by the ignorant.

* Comment. in Jo. Tom. 13. Volum. iv. p. 226. He asks Heracleon, who had quoted the κηρυγμα Πετρου,—ποτερον ποτε γνησιον ἐστιν, ἡ νοθον, ἡ μικτον;

In the first division or that of the Homologumena he includes the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul, the first of John and Peter, to these, he afterwards says, we may, if we judge fit, add the Apocalypse.

In the second division, or that of the disputed books, he reckons the Epistle of James, Jude, the second of Peter, and the second and third of John.

In the third division, ἐν τοις νοθοις, he has assigned a place to the *Acta Pauli*, to the *Pastor*[f], to the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, and to the instructions of the Apostles. Here also, he adds, may those, who choose, insert the Apocalypse of John: for some reject it, but others place it among the canonical books. Some have reckoned among these the Gospel to the Hebrews, which the converts from Judaism most zealously respect.

Now let us place them in their order, and minutely consider each assertion of the writer.

Ὁμολογουμενα are true and not counterfeit writings, ἀληθεις και ἀπλαστοι, and as he declares in the part before this chapter, genuine writings, γνησιαι γραφαι of those authors, whose names they bear, against which the ancients entertained no doubts, iii. 24., which of old the teachers quoted in their works as free from doubt, οις— —οι παλαι πρεσβυτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλεκτοις, ἐν τοις σφων αὐτων κατακεχρηνται συγγραμμασι, iii. 3.

Ἀντιλεγομενα are writings known to most Ecclesiastics, παρα πλειστοις των Ἐκκλησιαστικων, and in fact accounted genuine by many, γνωριμα πολλοις[g]. De-

[f] Hug here evidently alludes to Hermas Pastor; by *den Belehrungen der Apostel*, I conceive, he means the Constitutiones Apostolicæ, or the doctrinæ apostolorum, probably he intends the latter.—Translator.

[g] γνωριμος has this force in Euseb. iii. 38., where he says of the second Epistle of Clemens, οὐ μην ἐϑ' ὁμοιως τῃ πρoτερᾳ και ταυτην γνωριμον ἐσχηκαμεϑα.

ficiency of historical proof is adverse to their general recognition, for, not many of the ancient teachers have made mention of them in their works, οὐ πολλοι των παλαιων αὐτων ἐμνημονευσαν, ii. 23. Yet, as far as relates to the custom of the Church, they were publicly read in most communities, and made known to the congregation: μετα των λοιπων ἐν πλειστοις ΔΕΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΕΝΑ ἐκκλησιαις, ii. 23. ἐν πλειστοις ἐκκλησιαις παρα πολλοις ΔΕΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΕΝΑ, iii. 31.

Νοθα are writings not entirely to be rejected, which were composed with good intentions by orthodox men, yet by their titles they may so far lead people astray, as to account them Apostolical works, to which privilege they cannot institute even a dubious claim. Of this nature are the *Acta Pauli*, *Apocalypsis Petri*, *doctrinæ Apostolorum*, &c. We see from the sequel, that this is the meaning of the historian, where he accurately distinguishes them from the fabrications of the heretics under the names of the Apostles, such as the Gospel of Peter, Thomas, the *Acta* of Andrew and John, and solemnly avers, that they deserve no rank ἐν τοις νοθοις, nor even any class whatever, but are to be totally rejected, as impious and absurd productions. Here we meet with a variety of Christian literature, for which profane criticism has no subdivision nor expression; on which account Eusebius found no further place in his catalogue for the books of the Heretics [h].

[h] Hitherto, Eusebius has separated the classes, and kept them free from confusion. Yet, we might infer, when he speaks of the Epistle of James, ἱστεον δε ὡς νοθευεται μεν, that he confounds νοθα and *dντιλεγομενα*. But νοθευεται does not mean νοθον ἐστι, but νοθον νομιζεται ὑπο τινων, which is equivalent to *dντιλεγεται*. Cf. Eust. in Odyss. ψ. p. 1948. edit. Rom. ἱστεον δε ὁτι κατα την των παλαιων ἱστοριαν Ἀριστarχος και Ἀριστοφανης, οἱ κορυφαιοι των τοτε γραμματικων, εἰς το ὡς ἐρρηθη ἀσπασιοιο.... ἱκοντο. Od. ψ. 306. περατουσι την Ὀδυσσειαν, τα ἐφεξης ἑως τελους νοθευοντες· οἱ δε τοιουτοι πολλα

We may now advance to remarks on particular assertions of the historians. He ranks without restriction the Epistles of Paul in the first class, and passes over in silence the difference of opinion respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet this circumstance argues nothing against the knowledge of the historian. Elsewhere he speaks of it in these words: fourteen Epistles of Paul are well known and certain, yet we must not forget, that some, τινες, have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, under the pretext, that the Roman Church does not recognize it as a writing of Paul, iii. 3.

These some could not be Romans, since the whole community at Rome rejected it; it were also to say much too little, if by this we would understand the Westerns in general. They are therefore Greeks: —but as we perceive from his prelude, "fourteen Epistles of Paul are well known and certain;" *these some* had no influence on the opinions of the Oriental and Greek Churches. They were individuals, not of sufficient importance for the historiographer to particularize them in the part where he especially treats of the canon.

A little further, he places the Apocalypse both in the first and the last class; each time with the proviso, "as each may deem right:—then he adds, some reject it, and others class it among the ὁμολογουμενα. It therefore rather belonged to the second class, or that of disputed writings. But they had not yet agreed to lay aside all dispute on the question, and add the book for a while to the disputed class, until a future generation should pass sen-

των καιριωτατων περικοπτουσι, ὡς φασιν οἱ αὐτοις ἀντιπιπτοντες. Refer also Scholia Codd. 15. and 37. to the Epistle of James, and a similar Scholion in Matthæi, which remark on the title, ἱστεον μεν, ὡς τινες νοθευουσι την ἐπιστολην ταυτην, κ. τ. λ.

tence *sine irâ et studio*. For, the contest, as Eusebius elsewhere declares, consists still of advocates on both sides; ἐφ' ἑκατερον ἐτι νυν παρα τοις πολλοις περιλκεται ἡ δοξα, H. E. iii. 24. But how could the one or the other pass a decision, that it should be generally recognized?—a decision, which can only proceed from the generality. Certainly they could not do so: for then the Apocalypse must have heretofore existed among the Homologumena, and by later violence have been dispossessed of its rank: if so, *these some* persisted in the general recognition of it, whilst those, who attacked it, thought nothing of it. This is however the true state of the case: for, until Nepos of Arsinoe, about the middle of the third centuary, it was without dispute esteemed, as a production of the Apostle. We have treated the history of the book with care and proof in the second part. The opponents of the Millennium, which Nepos proves from the Apocalypse, endeavour to take it away from him, hoping thus to disarm him, and adduce the heretic Cerinthus as its author. Dionysius Alexandrinus, who was desirous of bringing the question to his own tribunal, disapproved of the rash assertion of the latter, but rendered the Nepotians defenceless by adopting a middle opinion, that the Apocalypse was written by John, not the Apostle, but by the Presbyter, whose grave was shewn near to that of the Apostle, at Ephesus. This hypothesis, dressed up with some plausible reasons, found approbation among the Asiatics, on which Eusebius expressed a decidedly contrary decision. Having spoken of the graves of both Johns at Ephesus, he adds, it is necessary to be correct on this point: for if the first John be not recognized as the author of the Apocalypse, which passes under his name, we may reasonably impute it to the second. H. E. iii. 39. Other-

wise, its place is among the νοθα, or among the writings of orthodox men, which have been erroneously enumerated among the Apostolic works.

In the same place, he speaks of the Gospel to the Hebrews, in the third class. Amongst these, he says, some have also reckoned the Gospel to the Hebrews, to which those who have been converted to Judaism are particularly attached. Those who have been converted from Judaism, are the *particular persons* who are to be distinguished from *the some.* These last, therefore, are not Christians converted from Judaism, but other members of the Asiatic Churches.

Still the passage, which directly concerns the principal question, is involved in difficulty. Eusebius, indeed, speaks of the book to the Hebrews in the third class, or that of νοθα; but words immediately precede, which relate to the Apocalypse: "some reject it, others place it in the series of canonical books." When he proceeds, among *these* some also reckon the Gospel to the Hebrews, we may either by *these* understand the ὁμολογουμενα, or the third class, the νοθα. The difference between the two assertions is great, and the decision in favour of one or the other is not at first sight very apparent.

Yet, I think, since we are employed in making divisions according to the classes, that the title of the class is that, which should determine the things arranged under it, not any secondary point which accidentally may have been forced into the context. Thus, the connecting words και προς τουτοις, ἐτι δε, ἠδη δ' ἐν τουτοις, refer all works to the title of their classification ἐν τοις νοθοις. Hence we must not forget, that τινες, *some* (even in so little as relates to the Apocalypse) are capable of yielding their meaning in favour of its general recognition, which is unconditionally requisite to grant to it a situation in the first class.

Again, if general opinion be favourable to the book, and some appealed with a degree of foundation to its universal admission, as an objection to the opposite party, Eusebius was forced to act as he did with the Apocalypse, and exhibit this Gospel in both classes.

Had the historian here concluded his account of the Canon, we should have been in no further embarrassment concerning the whole of his division. But now, after having treated of the whole, and separated one from the other, the ἀντιλεγομενα and the νοθα, he thus concludes: "all these belong to the disputed Scriptures" ταυτα μεν παντα των ἀντιλεγομενων ἀν εἰη. With this he finished the proposed division, and falls into another, which confounds the two last members of it.

A little further we meet with this sort of division, and a clear example of it. For where he concludes the age and history of the Apostles, he once more mentions their writings in these words, "We are as well acquainted with them, and the sacred writings which they have left behind them, as we are with the controverted writings ἀντιλεγομενων, from which we have separated those which are entirely spurious, παντελως νοθα, which wander widely from the pure Apostolical doctrine;" iii. 31. Here are the νοθα, which are contrary to pure doctrine; whilst, on the contrary, in the earlier division, writings της ἀληθους ὀρθοδοξιας ἀπαδουσαι, not being even deemed worthy of the third class, do not deserve to be called νοθα,—οὐδε ἐν τοις νοθοις αὐτα κατατακτεον.

When, however, the heretical books, a sort of Christian literature, which had neither class nor name in profane criticism, were, nevertheless, introduced into a class, the consequence of this erroneous conduct was, that the works of genuine Christian writers of a better class were forced among the Anti-

legomena; and thus two classes were thrown into one. The historian not wishing to appear inattentive in arranging this sort, also affixed it very much out of place as the conclusion of the chief clause of the Canon.

In addition to which, there is a great logical error in l. iii. 25, besides that of a third division thus involved in obscurity, viz. the division into ἐνδιαθηκους, and οὐκ ἐνδιαθηκους, *writings belonging and not belonging to the Testament*, which at first was regarded as the principal classification, and was discontinued afterwards. For he begun with promising to give a catalogue of the writings of the New Testament, της καινης διαθηκης, from which he soon deviated, and added the ἀντιλεγομενα and νοθα. Afterwards he called to mind his original design, and excuses himself by stating, that he felt the necessity of also adding a catalogue of the latter, although they be not included in the Testament. If Eusebius had possessed the accuracy requisite to this purpose, he would first have distinguished between ἐνδιαθηκους, and οὐκ ἐνδιαθηκους: then having subdivided the latter into ἀντιλεγομενας and νοθας γραφας, he would have remarked, that this also was a division, according to which the heretical writings occupied the third class, and the writings of orthodox teachers were raised to that of the Apostolical works, which were doubtful. Then the three totally distinct divisions, which the historian found, become manifest; which he, instead of explaining, has confounded one with another.

So far, therefore, as we proceed upon hypothesis in illustrating this remarkable passage, the problem will consist in bringing these three sorts of classification into harmony with each other; otherwise, in attempts to explain the one from the other, we are wearying ourselves with an endless employment.

SECTION XXI.

This was nearly the state of things, until the great Council at Nice, before which Eusebius had written his Ecclesiastical History. Not long after this congress for uniformity of Christian doctrine, the public opinion had turned in favour of those books which the historian reckoned among the ἀντιλεγομενα; so much so, that the catalogues of Africa, Asia, and the Western Churches overlooked this difference as not existing, put them on a par with the canonical books, and gave other divisions. The favorite opinion of the Asiatics with regard to the Apocalypse alone, was still too new for them to be able or willing immediately to abandon it.

Cyril of Jerusalem commands his pupils only to read the ὁμολογουμενα, but to leave untouched the ἀμφιβαλλομενα and ἀποκρυφα [h]. When he names all that they should read of the New Testament, he enumerates the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the fourteen Epistles of Paul, and the seven Catholic Epistles, concluding with the reiterated admonition, "these alone should be read [i]." He indeed still makes use of the more ancient classification, but includes among the homologumena, which alone they should read, the antilegomena of Eusebius, and passes by the Apocalypse, according to the custom of most Asiatics of that day. Nearly the same Gregory Nazianzen says in his Iambics [k], as well as

[h] Cyrill. Cateches. iv. §. 33.
[i] Cyrill. i. c. §. 36.
[k] Gregor. Nazians. Opp. T. ii. p. 98.

important change. But, the first general convocation of teachers from all parts of the earth, the numerous councils, which shortly followed it, made the reference to ecclesiastical usage and ancient traditional regulations very feasible, as they were maintained in regard to the sacred books and other things in the most remote regions of the Christian world. From the reciprocal communication and comparison of the established usage, otherwise unknown, and new sources of decision were obtained respecting the canon; so that, as far as relates to the want of testimony in the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the doubts thence arising against some of the Catholic Epistles, they could arrive by means of that, which traditional opinion and ecclesiastical custom recognized as true, at a satisfactory result. The quickly following change, the universality and uniformity of it in Asia, Africa and Europe, and the age in which it happened, direct us to this one peculiar view of the subject.

What degree of proof may be adjudged to the ancient usage and to the traditionary public opinion, is more to be decided by lawyers, than by Theologians, who form a different judgment, according to their respective creeds.

of the Church, and were so found in cotemporary teachers of the predominant school.

No less do we meet in the New Testament with some such very early passages, which are contrary to all our expectations. If we adopt, as the *terminus comparationis* the unanimous text of several hundred MSS., which have descended to us, or that of the versions of the fourth century, and the authors, who then and afterwards quote the New Testament, and contrast with them the citations of the oldest Fathers of the Church, as far as the middle of the third century, we cannot deny that in this early epoch, strange things happened in some MSS.

For the sake of first giving some specimens of this, we would extract here and there citations from the writings of a teacher, who adorned this ancient period by his learning. I mean Clemens Alexandrinus, who complained of those who had altered the Gospels in his day, *των μετατιθεντων τα ευαγγελια.* He supports his accusation with the following example, which might have been read in the MSS. after Matt. v. 9.—at least he has quoted it in this connection. *Μακαριοι οι δεδιωγμενοι απο της δικαιοσυνης, οτι αυτοι εσονται τελειοι· και μακαριοι οι δεδιωγμενοι ενεκα εμου, οτι εξουσι τοπον, οπου ου διωχθησονται* [p].

Nevertheless, his own MS. which he followed, had, if not so great, yet more important variations. Among others, he quotes the following words of our Saviour: *αιτειτε τα μεγαλα, και τα μικρα υμιν προστιθησεται· και αιτειτε τα επουρανια, και τα επιγεια υμιν προστιθησεται.* But not to leave the connection in which he read it doubtful, he again quotes it in another place, where it occurs in context with Matt. vi. 32, 33 [q].

[p] Lib. iv. Strom. c. 6. *versùs finem.*

[q] Lib. i. Strom. c. 24. Origenes de orat. c. 2.

In Matt. x. 42. Clemens read ποτηριον ψυχρου ὑδατος, and immediately afterwards, for the words, ἀπολεσῃ τον μισθον αὐτου,—ἀπολῃται ὁ μισθος αὐτου[r]. Amidst the whole stock of our critical sources, there is only one single ancient MS. which contains this reading.

There is a similar instance in Matt. xxiii. 27. οἱτινες ἐξωθεν μεν φαινονται ὡραιοι, which Clemens also reads, ἐξωθεν ὁ ταφος φαινεται ὡραιος, ἐσωθεν δε γεμει[s]. So likewise, Matt. xxv. 41. εἰς το πυρ το αἰωνιον, το ἡτοιμασμενον, which is thus expressed in Clemens, and also in Justin Martyr, εἰς το πυρ το αἰωνιον, ὁ ἡτοιμασεν ὁ πατηρ μου[t]. The one before mentioned is the only ancient MS. which assents to these peculiar readings.

We notice several such variations as these in this writer; nor is he the only one, who thus differs from the text. In this particular he had illustrious and great predecessors, such as Irenæus and Justin Martyr, from whom we have just extracted an example: there are others also, to whom this observation applies, as we can convince ourselves, by means of a further examination.

Yet we cannot be surprised at these appearances, since Origen, at the close of this epoch, has thus expressed himself, concerning the state of the Gospels. He says on Matt. xix. 19. (ἀγαπησεις τον πλησιον) "it might appear malicious to pronounce these words interpolations, unless in many other cases such a difference is found in the copies of the Gospels, that those of Matthew harmonize no more with them, than those of the other Evangelists. Yet (he proceeds) the difference of MSS. is very great indeed, as much in

[r] Quis dives Salvetur? c. 31.

[s] Pædagog. L. iii. edit. Sylburg. et Heins. p. 241. Ed. Ven. T. i. p. 282.

[t] Cohortat. ad Gent. c. 9. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 76.

consequence of the inattention of the transcribers, as of the headstrong conduct of those who had the care of correcting the transcripts; also, in consequence of those, who from their own judgment introduce emendations, add and expunge. In the copies of the Old Testament, by God's assistance, we have remedied this confusion..... and marked with an obelus in the LXX whatever is deficient in the Hebrew text, since we do not dare entirely to reject it: other passages we have added with an asterisk," &c. [u]

The ancients called the text of this first period, with regard to the LXX, κοινη ἐκδοσις, *vulgaris editio*, in which the private judgment and peculiar opinions of each reader and transcriber were left so free and unshackled, that at last positive necessity occasioned a revision of the text in different provinces [x].

The phrase originated in the school of the Alexandrine critics, where principally κοινη ἐκδοσις, κοινη ἀναγνωσις, frequently κοινη alone, also δημοτικη ἐκδοσις was applied by the ancients to the unrevised text of Homer, in contradistinction to the emendated editions διορθωσεις of Aristarchus, Zenodotus, and others [y]. As the version of the LXX was in the same

[u] Και εἰ μεν μη και περι ἀλλων πολλων διαφωνια ἡν προς ἀλληλα των ἀντιγραφων, ὡστε παντα τα κατα Ματθαιον μη συνᾳδειν ἀλληλοις, ὁμοιως δε και τα λοιπα εὐαγγελια..... νυν δε δηλονοτι ἡ των ἀντιγραφων διαφορα, εἰτε ἀπο ῥᾳθυμιας τινων γραφεων, εἰτε ἀπο τολμης τινων μοχθηρας της διορθωσεως των γραφομενων, εἰτε και ἀπο των τα ἑαυτου δοκουντα ἐν τῃ διορθωσει προστιθεντων, ἡ ἀφαιρουντων την μεν οὐν ἐν τοις ἀντιγραφοις της παλαιας διαθηκης διαφωνιαν Θεου δεδοντος, εὑρομεν ἰασασθαι. In Matt. Tom. xv. viii. ed. Ruæi. p. 671.—ed. Huetii. Colon. p. 381.

[x] Hieronym. Ep. cvi. n. 2. ad Sunniam et Fretellam. Sed hoc interest inter utramque, quod κοινη pro locis et temporibus, et pro voluntate Scriptorum vetus corrupta editio est.

[y] Schol. in Il. B. 53. ed. Wassenberg, Franck. 1783. Schol. Ambrosian. in Odyss. K. 74. ed. Maii. Schol. Marcian. Villoison. in Il. B. 169. P. 214. X. 468. O. 344.

state as Homer's text anciently, the same critical term was also referred to its text, in relation to Origen's correction of it [z]. Jerome likewise made use of this term to designate the early neglected text of the Latin version both of the Old and New Testament, rendering κοινη by *communis*, and δημοτικη ἐκδοσις by *vulgata editio* [a].

Having thus actually shewn, that in the writings of the New Testament there existed a state which might be compared to the more ancient state of Homer's works, or the translation of the LXX, we shall be justified in calling this state up to the emendations, which took place in the third century, the epoch of the κοινη ἐκδοσις.

SECTION XXIII.

If at any time we could find among our literary stock an ancient MS., which was perfectly free from the text of later times, and exhibited those readings which we have just extracted from Clemens, which contained not merely these and several others, which elsewhere occur in his writings, but every one of the variations and peculiar readings of the most ancient Fathers, down to the third century, or at least a considerable part of them, what else should we say of it, than that it expressed the text of the period, or the κοινη ἐκδοσις, which preceded the critical labours?

We are in possession of such a MS.:—it is the famous Cambridge MS., which contains the preceding peculiar readings in Clemens. It is also that which

[z] Hieron. ad Sun. et. Fretell. §. 2. quam Origenes et Cæsareensis Eusebius, omnesque Græciæ tractatores κοινην, id est, *communem* appellant atque *vulgatam*.

[a] Hier. l. cit. et Comment. in Matt. xiii. 35. in Ep. ad Galat. v. 24.

in general exclusively gives in its text the variations of the oldest Fathers of the Church. By critics it is designated by the mark D, under which it also here appears.

At first we are desirous of more expressly establishing the fact, after which we will subjoin some remarks. The preceding examples are extracted from Matthew: the following, which are brought into comparison, are passages from the Gospel of Luke.

At the baptism of Jesus, after the words "this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Luke iii. 22), Clemens adds, ἐγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε. Justin Martyr [b] has likewise this addition, and among all the MSS. D alone has it. Irenæus has in the Greek text [c], which has here survived, cited οὐκ ἠδειτε (Luke ii. 49.) as οὐκ οἰδατε:—D reads the same. According to Epiphanius, Marcion (Luke v. 14.) had in his copy, ἱνα εἰς μαρτυριον ὑμιν τουτο. The Father considered this difference to have been wilfully made by the heretic: D, however, reads exactly the same; and we may so much the more be certified that it is an ancient and genuine reading, because Marcion's most inveterate opponent also had it in his book. "Itaque adjecit (Christus) *ut sit vobis in testimonium*. Sine dubio, quod testabatur, se legem non dissolvere sed implere," &c. [d] Precisely as little reason is there for supposing that Marcion altered the words ἐν δε τῳ ὑπαγειν, in Luke viii. 42., into ἐγενετο ἐν τῳ ὑπαγειν, as D and two other old MSS. still read it:—besides, the Latin translators found about this period the same reading in the copies from which they made their version. *Cod. Veronens. Cod. Vercell. in Blanch. Evangel.*

[b] Clem. Pædag. L. i. p. 92. Heinsii et Sylv. p. 113. Venet. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 88.

[c] L. 1. adv. Hier. c. 20. n. 2.

[d] Tertullian, L. iv. adv. Marcion.

quadr. According to Epiphanius, he also had, instead of τις ὁ ἁψαμενος μου in Luke viii. 45., the equivalent words τις μου ἡψατο in his book, exactly as in D and Origen. In Luke ix. 22. μετα τρεις ἡμερας stood in Marcion's copy, according to the account of Epiphanius, for τῃ τριτῃ ἡμερᾳ; we see in Codex D nearly the same, μεθ' ἡμερας τρεις. Tertullian[e] had a reading between both, μετα την τριτην ἡμεραν. Nor is there any sign of falsification even in Luke xxiv. 37. where Marcion, instead of the harsh πνευμα θεωρειν, read φαντασμα θεωρειν, as we again meet with it in Cod. D. If this reading had been deemed favouring the doctrine of the believers in *phantasmata*, the following verses would necessarily have been altered, or destroyed, which Marcion has not done[f]. But we will no longer detain ourselves about the readings in Marcion, many of which still exist in D, concerning which no suspicion of intentional corruption can arise as to the question whether they are adducible as characteristics of the text at this time.

In Luke ix. 60. Irenæus[g] has in the Greek, συ δε πορευθεις διαγγελλε, with which D alone agrees, and at x. 61. both uniformly[h] read ἐπιτρεψον δε μοι πρωτον. At x. 62. Clemens has this peculiarity, εἰς τα ὀπισω βλεπων, και ἐπιβαλων την χειρα αὐτου ἐπ' ἀροτρον[i], which occurs in no MS. but in D. Justin Martyr adds after the words, ὁ ἀθετων ὑμας, ἐμε ἀθετει, in Luke x. 16., ὁ δε ἐμου ἀκουων, ἀκουει του ἀποστειλαντος με, which we still find in Hippolytus and D[k]. Clemens has thus quoted Luke xii. 11. ὁταν δε φερωσιν ὑμας εἰς τας, and μη προμε-

[e] Tertullian, l. iv. adv. Marc. l. iv. c. 21.

[f] Tertull. l. iv. adv. Marc. c. 42, 43. de carne Christ. c. 5.

[g] L. i. adv. Hær. c. 8. n. 3.

[h] Iren. loc. cit.

[i] L. vii. Strom. c. 16.

[k] Justin. Apol. major. c. 16. Hippolyt. de charismat. c. 26. The Latin vers. of Irenæus: præf. ad Lib. iii. adv. Hæres.

ριμνατε; but he has omitted ἠ τι before ἀπολογησησθε, exactly as it stands in D[l]. The passage in Luke xii. 27. πως αὐξανει, οὐ κοπιᾳ οὐδε νηθει, he thus renders, πως οὐτε νηθει, οὐτε ὑφαινει, just as it occurs in D alone[m]. Instead of περισσοτερον αἰτησουσιν αὐτον in Luke xii. 48. this MS. reads, πλεον ἀπαιτησουσιν αὐτον. We perceive from a free quotation of Justin, that his text contained this various reading; for he says, πλεον ἀπαιτηθησεται, in which Clemens concurs with him[n]. Instead of ἐν τῃ δευτερᾳ, και τῃ τριτῃ φυλακῃ, Luke xii. 38. the translator of Irenæus, read, "*et si venerit in vespertinâ vigiliâ*," just so do we find it in Greek in Marcion and in D, τῃ ἑσπερινῃ φυλακῃ. Ἐργαται ἀνομιας (Luke xiii. 27.) occur in Justin for οἱ ἐργαται της ἀδικιας, as well as in the second Epistle of Clemens Romanus[p] (if it be written by him), and again in D. In Luke xiv. 8. Clemens Alexandrinus omits ὑπο τινος after κληθης, and at v. 10. reads for πορευθεις ἀναπεσαι εἰς ἐσχατον τοπον,—εἰς τον ἐσχατον τοπον ἀναπιπτε; and says, soon afterwards, at v. 16. δειπνον μεγαν[q]. All this we again exactly perceive in D. Irenæus, in the Greek remains of his writings, renders, likewise, σημερον γαρ ἐν τῳ οἰκῳ in Luke xix. 5. ὁτι σημερον ἐν τῳ οἰκῳ, which is to be found in no MS. but in D[r]. For τῳ ἐχοντι δοθησεται, in Luke xix. 26. Clemens says τῳ ἐχοντι προστιθησεται, and D προστιθεται[s]; these alone here interchange διδωμι and προστιθημι, thus in xxiii. 46. D and Justin Martyr approximate[t] in

[l] Strom. l. iv. c. 9.
[m] Pædagog. l. ii. Sylb. 198. Venet. 231.
[n] Justin Apol. major. c. 17. Clem. Strom. l. ii. c. ult.
[o] L. v. adv. Hæres. c. 34. n. 2.
[p] Justin Apol. maj. c. 16. Clem. Rom. Ep. ii. c. 4.
[q] Pædagog. l. ii. p. 141. Sylburg. et 165. ed. Venet.
[r] L. i. c. viii. n. 3.
[s] Strom. l. vii. c. 10.
[t] Dial. cum Tryph. c. 105.

and circumstances of it are placed before us, at an easy view. We need here only to open our eyes, and consolidate our observations, to sketch the rise of these changes. Here the blunders of transcribers are not to the purpose:—if so, who would be able to compose its history? They are dispersed into numberless degeneracies, for which at one glance there appears no point of reconciliation.

First,—It was one careful object of the readers of the Bible to make it as intelligible as possible. In the place of an expression difficult to be comprehended, they therefore frequently wrote one more simple over the line, or on the margin of their MS: —this was agreed upon, as the space which the readers always appropriated to their own understanding of passages and remarks. One of these expressions, for instance, which was obscure to the Greeks, was κηνσος in Mark xii. 14.; they therefore placed by the side of it the pure Greek word ἐπικεφαλαιον, which was afterwards admitted by a copyist into the text, and thus found its place in D. Thus, some one understood the narrative in Luke xii. 36, as a transaction which happened in the day: yet, according to the Greek division of time, the τριτη φυλακη was the μεσονυκτιον. To remedy this misapprehension, which, according to his idea, the passage induced, he arranged the term according to the custom of the Romans, who divided the day also, *in quatuor excubias*, and added his own interpretation ἑσπερινη φυλακη, which hence was introduced into several MSS. He was not without erudition, who explained the indefinite expression, and intelligible to Jews alone (in Matt. xxvi. 15.), viz. τριακοντα ἀργυρια by τριακοντα στατηρας. This love of exposition is manifest in our valuable MS. not merely in particular words, but in whole sentences; *e. g.* Mark x. 12. ἐαν γυνη ἀπολυσῃ τον ἀν-

ἐτελεσεν ταυτα τα ῥηματα λαλων, ἠλθεν εἰς Καφερν—Luke vii. 1.

However numerous these examples are in the κοινη ἐκδοσις, yet the observation is correct, that it still contains many Hebraisms, which were entirely destroyed by those who in the third century, with equal sense and critical judgment, prepared the recensions of the text. To substantiate this important remark, I will add some specimens. The later text of Mark xiv. 25. has οὐκετι μη πιω, where D still has προσθε πιειν. Luke xii. 10. ἀφεθησεται αὐτῳ, εἰς δε το Πνευμα ἁγιον οὐκ ἀφεθησεται, but the more recent text, ἀφεθησεται αὐτῳ, τῳ δε εἰς το ἁγιον Πνευμα βλασφημησαντι οὐκ ἀφεθησεται. Or John ix. 11. ἀπηλθον οὐν και ἐνιψαμην, και ἠλθον βλεπων, whereas the more recent text has, ἀπελθων δε και νιψαμενος ἀνεβλεψα.

Thirdly,—Others laboured in a different manner to make their text more intelligible, or to give to it a greater degree of explicitness, and therefore transferred the words on the same passage from one Evangelist to the margin of the other: by these means they expected to illustrate the writers; and finally, little by little, the notes wandered into the text. The fact is too well known to require examples: yet I will adjoin one on account of its particular absurdity. In Mark xiii. 2. where our Saviour speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem, and adds, that no stone shall be left upon another, the κοινη ἐκδοσις proceeds, και δια τριων ἡμερων ἀλλος ἀναστησεται ἀνευ χειρων· these words which are adjoined to ὁς οὐ μη καταλυθη, are evidently, as their sense shews, transposed from John ii. 19.

Such readers also wrote the original expression of the prophets of the Old Testament, where it had been freely quoted, and not according to the full contents of the passage in the New, or they affixed that which was deficient, as in Matt. xiii. 14. where Isaiah's in-

his claim to ἐνδυουσιν, because it was formed from Matthew's ἐκδυσαντες, in the same way as Matthew had formed his χλαμυδα κοκκινην. The pretended harmony of Ammonius, according to Victor Capuanus, thus renders this passage: et exuentes eum, induunt tunicam purpuream, et chlamydem coccineam circumdederunt ei [u]. If we have now drawn a conclusion from the state of the text, as to the arrangement of a harmonist, the conclusion approaches to a proof founded upon fact. The genealogy of Matthew, which in D is changed to the order in Luke, plainly shews such an attempt to exhibit the one in combination with the other. Moreover, the known interpolation of MS. D in Matt. xx. 28. which, in respect of magnitude, has nothing like to it, appears to have had this origin. As to matter, it exists in Luke xvi. 8., but it is treated most freely and periphrastically. That it stands in a certain connexion with other doctrines of Jesus, joined together on account of their similarity, is evident from the first clause, which is not borrowed from Luke, but from some other source, ὑμεις δε ζητειτε ἐκ μικρου αὐξησαι, και ἐκ μειζονος ἐλαττον εἰναι. From its introduction, it has a perfect appearance of being connected with those doctrinal discourses of Jesus, in which he explains to his disciples the doctrine of the future state on many occasions; to which, indeed, it fully corresponds. If this be the case, there cannot be much doubt that it was formerly inserted in some paraphrastic harmony.

Fifthly,—Sometimes a reader found a passage or narrative in the apocryphal books which pleased him; this he wrote in some part of the blank space

[u] Ammonii Alexand. Sanctor. quatuor Evangel. Harmonia. interp. Victore Episc. Capuano. c. CLXIX. Galland. Biblioth. Patr. T. ii.

of his copy: then it only required an ignorant *librarius* to insert it into the text of the next transcript taken from it. Thus the narrative in Luke vi. 5. was inserted, τῃ αὐτῃ ἡμερᾳ θεασαμενος τινα ἐργαζομενον τῳ Σαββατῳ, εἰπεν αὐτῳ· Ἀνθρωπε, εἰ μεν οἰδας τι ποιεις, μακαριος εἰ, εἰ δε μη οἰδας, ἐπικαταρατος και παραβατης εἰ του νομου. To this, a passage in Justin Martyr may probably be referred, ταυτα γαρ τα τεκτονικα ἐργα εἰργαζετο, ἐν ἀνθρωποις ὠν, ἀροτρια και ζυγα, δια τουτων και της δικαιοσυνης συμβολα διδασκων, και ἐνεργη βιον [x]. It came into his text from the Evangelium infantiæ Christi: Stroth [y], who wished to deduce it from the Gospel to the Hebrews, forgot that this book commenced with onr Lord's baptism, and therefore excluded the history of his youth.

Sixthly,—The custom of reading these books in the public assemblies, often caused extraneous additions to them. They were forced to divide them into particular sections, and these sections separated parts of the history from their context, and the Church-reading began with a detached passage. To avoid this want of connexion, an introduction preceded the reading, which the Anagnostic, for his own use, wrote on the Church copies. Thus interpolations or minor transformations of the text arose in great numbers; the occasion and origin of which may easily be perceived, if we will take the pains of examining if the beginning of an anagnosis was at the suspected passage. I will not accumulate examples on a point which has long ceased to be doubtful. In Luke xvi. 19., an anagnosis began with the words ἀνθρωπος δε τις ἠν πλουσιος. The beginning was too abrupt, therefore the narrative was preceded by

[x] Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 88.

[y] Repertorium of Biblical and Oriental Literature—Part the first.

these words, εἰπεν δε και ἑτεραν παραβολην, as we still read it in the text of D. We may compare Luke xii. 2., where the anagnosis began, οὐδεν δε συγκεκαλυμμενον, and perceive how the κοινη ἐκδοσις has converted the preceding passage ἐν οἰς ἐπισυναχ. into an introduction. Another lesson is from John xiv. 1., μη ταρασσεσθω.... which was preceded by the formula, και ἐιπεν τοις μαθηταις αὐτου. Sometimes an end was added to it where it seemed somewhat too brief and abrupt: one of this description ends (Luke vi. 10.) with the words, και ἐλεγεν αὐτοις· ὁτι Κυριος ἐστιν ὁ υἱος του ἀνθρωπου και του σαββατου, which is taken totally from a different place.

Seventhly,—Another sort of alterations consists of omissions, as they are called; but we speak only of those which bear the mark of a fixed design. Since it frequently happened, that glosses and expositions on the margin improperly had crept into the text, the *diorthotæ*, or correctors of MSS. might have often indulged suspicions against such expressions or passages, judging of these elucidatory remarks according to their own ideas of criticism. They now either thoroughly exercised their supposed right over them, by striking them out, or affixing to them marks of rejection. In Matt. xiii. 1. ἐν τῃ ἡμερᾳ ἐκεινῃ ἐξελθων ὁ Ἰησους, the words ἀπο της οἰκιας appear to be supernumerary and a gloss, and as such it is banished from the κοινη ἐκδοσις. Not less superfluous in Matt. xxii. 24., after ἐπιγαμβρευσει ὁ ἀδελφος αὐτου, were την γυναικα αὐτου, for ἐπιγαμ. includes it, which is sufficiently confirmed by ἀναστησει σπερμα, therefore την γυν. αὐτ. were removed. In Mark xv. 24., τις τι ἀρῃ are implied in the preceding βαλλοντες κληρον ἐπ' αὐτα, consequently they are omitted in the κοινη ἐκδοσις.

Eighthly,—There were cases somewhat like this when it seemed necessary to reject something. Syno-

nymous phrases or passages, immediately following each other, were imperfections in Greek construction, which no good writer would tolerate without a particular reason. A reader or corrector, who merely judged as a Greek, and was ignorant of the peculiar construction and custom of the Jewish language, would incontrovertibly deem himself authorized by the grammatical laws of his own nation, to expunge from the text one of two * *anonymous* passages, as a scholion. This occurs in Mark viii. 15., where in the two equivalent words ὁρατε, βλεπετε, the first is rejected; or in Mark xi. 28., where ἐν ποιᾳ ἐξουσιᾳ ταυτα ποιεις, and the immediately following και τις σοι την ἐξουσιαν ταυτην ἐδωκεν, are nearly of the same import; and the rejection is accordingly decreed against the last. In Luke xxi. 15. δυνησονται ἀντειπειν ἡ ἀντιστηναι, —ἀντειπειν was in fact expressed by ἀντιστηναι, therefore it was expunged. In John x. 18. the words ἀλλ' ἐγω τιθημι αὐτην ἀπ' ἐμαυτου appear, as well as the preceding, to be equally contained in the subsequent construction; therefore they were omitted as a tautology.

Of this sort are the different observations founded on fact, which the MS. D affords to us, for sketching the state of the text, at the period of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, and for elucidating that part of its history which the light of criticism has only weakly illustrated.

SECTION XXV.

NEVERTHELESS, our representation of the κοινη ἐκδοσις would be very incorrect, if we expected to find all the corruptions to which it was exposed, united

* This appears an error of the press, for *synonymous*.—TRANSL.

in one single MS.:—their lot must necessarily have been different in each province, in every ten years, and in every house. What a diligent, acute, or incompetent reader wrote on his MS. or arranged into particular passages, was not transferred to all books, nor communicated to every country and individual: such private scholia frequently did not pass the threshold of their birth-place, and perished with the manuscript; whilst, on the contrary, others were circulated far and wide by means of transcripts, and were increased by other hands. This accords with Jerome's words on the state of the LXX: κοινη pro locis et temporibus, et pro voluntate Scriptorum vetus corrupta est.

When we have extracted from D the different classes of corruptions, we must not expect from this MS. every individual case which may be distributed under them. Other exemplaria had still many more, which we here seek in vain. For instance, Irenæus read in his book εἰς την παγιδα for ἐπι την γην, Matt. x. 29., and he thus expressly comments upon it: si quis, quod dictum est,.... enumerare voluerit captos ubique passeres,.... et causam requirere, ob quam heri tanti hodiè iterùm tanti capti sint [a], &c. This reading occurs more frequently in Origen and other writers; but it has remained unknown to D. Justin has in this manner quoted Matt. xix. 17. εἰς ἐστιν ἀγαθος, ὁ πατηρ ὁ ἐν οὐρανοις [b]:—this was also in the copy of Irenæus, ὁ πατηρ ὁ ἐν οὐρανοις [c]. Still more extraordinary does the passage in Matt. vii. 22. appear, as Justin read it: πολλοι ἐρουσι μοι· Κυριε, ἐν τῳ σῳ ὀνοματι ἐφαγομεν, και ἐπιομεν, και δυναμεις ἐποιησαμεν [d]. In

[a] L. ii. adv. Hær, c. 26. n. 2.
[b] Dial. cum. Tryph. c. 96.
[c] L. i. adv. Hær. c. 20. n. 2.
[d] Apol. maj. c. 16. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 76.

occasionally remarked, on the margin of it, some which were perfectly unique, which might be regarded as specimens of its similarity to the κοινη ἐκδοσις in other books. After Matt. xxvii. 16. λεγομενον Βαραββαν, his margin proceeds ὁστις δια στασιν τινα γενομενην ἐν τῃ πολει και φονον ἠν βεβλημενος εἰς φυλακην. Luke xx. 23. αὐτων την πονηριαν, την ὑποκρισιν αὐτων. Luke xxii. 18. ἑως ὁπου καινον πιω αὐτο ἐν τῃ βασιλειᾳ του Θεου. John iii. 6. γεγεννημενον ἐκ του ὑδατος και του Πνευμ. . . . John xviii. 13. του ἐνιαυτου ἐκεινου, ἀπεστειλεν οὐν αὐτον ὁ Ἄννας δεδεμενον προς Καϊαφαν τον Ἀρχιερεα.

It is so little possible to become acquainted with the κοινη ἐκδοσις from one particular MS., that by means of our examination of the important document in the public library at Cambridge, we rather convince ourselves, how much reason we still have to desire many like to it. Yet, since fate decreed that only one MS. of this description should escape the ravages of capricious time, it is fortunate that such a lot befel this, which on account of the many casualties, to which it has been exposed, has become the more instructive to us.

But where, in what country, was its text at first so formed? In Egypt? or rather, in Alexandria, in particular? This is my opinion, and it seems to me as correct as any critical datum can be. It indeed contains readings of several fathers of the second and third century, as we have copiously proved; yet throughout the range of the whole text, in the proportionate retention of minuter readings, which occur sparingly, but acutely characterize it by their uniformity, it approaches nearest to those copies which Clemens Alexandrinus used in his researches, as well as to those which Origen followed in those writings of his, which are earlier than the emendation of the

text, by which he has crowned his services to the Christian school. We can also produce it in confirmation of one of those MSS. from which Thomas of Charkel collected readings, on the margin of the Philoxenian version, in the Monastery of the Antonians, at Alexandria. Whence, I conclude, that the text of this MS. was first formed in Alexandria or Egypt, before it entered on its more extended migrations, and that it exhibits to us the κοινη ἐκδοσις of this district.

SECTION XXVI.

We are however in possession of still another document, of nearly the same date, which boasts no more purity of Greek, although it gives to us considerable information respecting the state of the text: this is the old Syrian version, or the Peschito, the origin of which according to the most accurate computation, is assigned to the third century.

In many points, such as minute readings and their peculiarities, it has a striking resemblance to the Cambridge MS., as it has long been agreed by the learned in these matters: we are therefore exempted from a further proof of our assertion. Yet, however nearly it be connected with this MS., and however much of its style and want of polish it may have, it nevertheless does not lose its own peculiar character, and pursues freely and frequently without the aid of any one MS., its own natural course.

Its resemblance to D often recalls to us the same peculiarities, which we have already remarked; but it is distinguished by a number of newer, and for the most part of more exclusive readings, and of novel instances in very great quantities: and I have scarcely perceived one of them, which is not comprehended

under the preceding species. They consist of more lucid expressions substituted for the more obscure, or of indefinite passages, which have been facilitated by a slight alteration, or by an interpolation. For example, in Matt. xxi. 34. τους καρπους are made more definite by the addition of του ἀμπελωνος αὐτου —in Luke xii. 45. παιδισκας is so rendered by that of του κυριου αὐτου :—or in Luke ix. 34. where for ἐκεινους εἰσελθειν, the sentence ὁτι ἐβλεψαν Μωϋσην και Ἠλιαν ἀνελθοντας εἰς την νεφ. ...is inserted. It has also introduced passages from one Gospel into the other, as in Matt. xxviii. 18. after και ἐπι γης, the words και καθως ἀπεσταλκε με ὁ πατηρ μου, καγω ἀποστελλω ὑμας, or in Luke ix. 39. after κραζει, the words και τριζει τους ὀδοντας αὐτου, &c. Some additions have likewise arisen by means of the Church-lessons, as in Luke xv. 11., where in the Syrian Church the beginning of a lesson for the fifth day of the first week in Lent is marked out; wherefore the passage was thus altered : εἰπε δε αὐτοις παλιν ὁ Ἰησους, ἀνθρωπος τις.... Some passages were also omitted from the suspicion that they were glosses, or elucidatory remarks, as in Mark vii. 2. κοιναις χερσι, τουτ' ἐστιν. In short, the instances, which we here discover, are perfectly like to those already enumerated, and no new species of variations any where presents itself.

On the other hand, the text of the κοινη ἐκδοσις in Syria was not once exposed to so many intrusions, as that of the MS. D. The harshness, on account of Hebrew phrases and idioms was not perceptible in this ; for they did not seem strange to the Syrian, being analogous to his own tongue, consequently, in this respect, its text was more fortunate. Nor is there any trace of the influence of the Apocryphal books in it, and what is still less to be expected, not even that of the harmonies, although that of Tatian was

continually read in these regions, and remained the longest in estimation and public reception. Probably, however, with regard to this last, the case may once have been different. Thomas of Charkel remarked, that he found this greater variation, ὑμεις δε ζητειτε ἐκ μικρων αὐξησαι, κ.τ.λ. on the margin of Matt. xx. 28., only in Greek copies, in this passage: yet it occurs in Luke in MSS. of the Peschito. He also declares, that in another passage, viz. in Luke xx. 34., he found in an old MS. of the Peschito for γαμουσι the reading γεννωνται και γεννωσιν, which he met with in no Greek MS. Hence might we conclude that the text, which the oldest version of the Syriac followed, was much richer in singular and various readings, and that probably a later revision of this version curtailed the more daring excrescences of the text, and only spared the minor variations, which still remain in very great numbers.

But, how came it to be so circumstanced? clearly to answer this question, probably we have no surviving means; or they among other hidden things await the day, which shall draw them forth from oblivion, however this may occur: yet the fact, at least as far as we can judge of it, is correct. The κοινη ἐκδοσις of the Syrian Province is much purer than that of Alexandria and Egypt; and this fact is very naturally indeed explained from the local circumstances, which differently operated on the text in both countries. Literature of every sort in Alexandria flowed to and from the city; and probably, this is the birth-place of many Apocrypha. A host of Librarii, Diorthotæ and Grammarians were here in constant employment on all that was good and bad in the sciences, and each carried the vapours of his own learning into the neighbouring atmosphere, which may not have a little contributed to form that

philosophizing and obstreperous tone in the populous city, for which it became celebrated. The Syrians indeed frequently travelled hither at this period, to acquire knowledge and science: yet they always lived insulated among themselves, and all that they did on papyrus was collected here, and continued fixed to this country, which possessed the monopoly of it. In a place where the duty of Emendator or Scholiast, or the pretension of it was so general, it could not but be, that the text was exposed to much treatment, which did not happen to it elsewhere.

The MSS. of the κοινη ἐκδοσις in Syria had, notwithstanding this, several important readings, which we in vain seek for in the Egyptian. I will here exhibit some of them, which might be considered as characteristic, since they enable us to recognize those passages which have successively been derived from this text, and to retrace them to their origin. One of these is clearly in Matt. vi. 13. which so completely differs from all the preceding, that it must evidently have been derived from the public forms of prayer; it is the well known addition, ὁτι σου ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεια, και ἡ δυναμις, και ἡ δοξα, εἰς τους αἰωνας. There are also others in Matt. xx. 22, 23. μελλω πινειν,—και το βαπτισμα, ὁ ἐγω βαπτιζομαι, βαπτισθηναι:—in Mark vi. 11. εἰς μαρτυριαν αὐτοις,—ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν, ἀνεκτοτερον ἐσται Σοδομοις, ἡ Γομορροις, ἐν ἡμερᾳ κρισεως, ἡ τῃ πολει ἐκεινῃ:—in Mark xiii. 14. της ἐρημωσεως,—το ῥηθεν ὑπο Δανιηλ του Προφητου:—in Luke iv. 18. ἀπεσταλκε με,—ἰασασθαι τους συντετριμμενους την καρδιαν.

SECTION XXVII.

THESE are the two principal stocks of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, which we yet know, of which the Syrian did not pass beyond its original space, although the African, on the other hand, far extended its branches into the western Churches. Alexandria, for a long time afterwards, supplied the West with Greek transcripts of every learned work, and from thence[f] the West also obtained the MSS. of the New Testament.

When in Italy and on the northern coast of Africa they prepared about the end of the second or in the third century, Latin versions of the New Testament, they were also made from the κοινη ἐκδοσις. How could it be otherwise? since as yet not one of the recensions existed, which sprung up nearly about the close of the third century. The agreement of these versions with D is undeniable and striking, and it requires not another word to prove, that they came from similar Greek copies.

So simple and historically true is this conclusion concerning their mutual agreement, and so near to our observation does it lie, that were a person inclined to look farther, he would conjecture causes, which are neither discoverable nor natural. The Latins have been accused of altering the Greek text from their versions, and of modelling it to them. But did they then interpolate the exemplaria of Justin Martyr and of Clemens Alexandrinus from their versions? Had they also their emissaries in Syria, for the sake of falsifying the Greek text, or the

[f] Suetonius in Domitiano. c. 20. Quanquam bibliothecas incendio absumptas impensissimè reparare curâsset, exemplaribus undique petitis, missisque Alexandriam, qui describerent emendarentque.

copies of the Peschito? Did they, also, falsify the Syriac MSS. of the Nestorians? Besides: did they alter the codex of the Marcion, according to their views and version? Was there a Latin version in the time of Irenæus? or, if such did exist, did they in passages, modify the Greek text after it? was it so much the idol of the Latins?

When, however, did the Latins begin to think so highly of their version, and to set it up as the standard of the text? Tertullian was aware of nothing of the sort, when he said: "it is not so in the Greek, as it is in an artful or silly *eversion* (a play on words for a wretched version) which is now common among the Latins[g]." As little was Victorinus conscious of it, when he says on Matt. vi. 11. "It is otherwise in the Greek, but the Latins did not comprehend it, or were not in a state to express it[h]." Hilary of Poitiers does not speak more honorably of it, and consequently goes back to the Greek expression[i], and Ambrosius sometimes appeals by way of deciding a point to the text in that tongue, *unde transtulerunt Latini*[k].

Augustine has expressed himself so forcibly and definitively on this point, particularly in his books *de doctrinâ Christianâ*, that it must have been a modern production. "Et Latinæ quidem linguæ ho-

[g] Tertull. de Monogam. c. 11.

[h] Victorin. L. ii. contrà Arian. c. 8. L. i. c. 49.

Hilar. tract. in Ps. 138. n. 43. Latina translatio, dum virtutem dicti ignorat, magnam intulit obscuritatem, non discernens ambigui sermonis proprietatem, quod enim nobiscum scribitur. Cùm Græcis hoc modò est.... Cf. tract. in Ps. 118. litt. Hz. n. 1. et de Trin. L. xi. n. 17. Secundum Latinitatem obscurius hoc dictum videtur (Eph. i. 17.) quià Latinitas pronominibus non utitur, quæ Græcitas, usû honesto et necessario semper usurpat. Ità enim scribitur, ὁ θεος του κυριου, κ. τ. λ.

[k] Ambros. de Spir. Sancto. L. ii. c. 5. de Fide L. ii. c. 4.

mines (he says in L. ii. de doctr. Christ. c. 11.) quos nunc instruendos suscepimus, duabus aliis ad Scripturarum divinarum cognitionem opus habent, Hebræâ scilicet et Græcâ, ut ad exemplaria *præcedentia* recurratur, siquam dubitationem attulerit Latinorum interpretum varietas." We frequently cannot comprehend the translators (he proceeds, L. ii. de doctr. Christ. c. 14.) unless we call to our aid the tongue from whence they made their translation: how often, from want of requisite learning, do they miss the sense! We are therefore obliged to examine the original tongues: "linguarum illarum, ex quibus in Latinam Scriptura pervenit, petenda cognitio est." Shortly afterwards, in the 16th Ch. of the same book, he says, "libros autem Novi Testamenti, siquid in Latinis varietatibus titubat, Græcis cedere oportere *dubium non est.*" But if hitherto such have been the positions of all the illustrious teachers of the Latin Church, with what reason can it be conceived, that those MSS. called *Codices Latinizantes*, are distortions of the text on the authority of the Latin versions?

Jerome's opinion on this subject is generally known; and the later teachers, Sedulius, Beda, Atto of Vercelli did not differ on this point from their predecessors. Yet, whilst these sentiments were in full force, the great schism of the Greeks and Latins took place, and separated the two Churches from each other to such a degree, that the latter, if even they desired it, were allowed to have no further influence on the rites, faith, or the books of the dioceses, which belonged to the Greek Patriarchate.

Yet, I will not assert, that the inhabitants of Magna Græcia or of the south of Gaul, or even the Readers in Rome, who were acquainted with the Greek language, did not anciently write glosses,

expositions and ill-judged emendations in MSS. They may have done so with the same degree of right, as their brethren did, in Asia, in Peloponnesus, or in Alexandria, although our observations on the history of the text only exhibit to us one example, (viz. Luke xii. 36. ἐσπερινῃ φυλακῃ) which rather betrays an Italian than a purely Greek origin; but I stedfastly deny that any one of old designedly from prejudice and overweening veneration for the Latin version, falsified the Greek copies from it, and interpolated the Bibles of other countries and people. Such an idea learned men could only conceive probable, at a moment, when they forgot their learning; an idea, which has hitherto been the greatest obstacle to the development of the history of the text.

If we regard the inadequacy of occidental copyists, as for example in the phrases πετρους, λεπρωσου, κατεγελων αὐτου, which are found in D, as a proof of the corruptions of the Latins, let us recollect, that in this inquiry no question can arise from the unintentional incompetency of transcribers.

Again,—if they so interpolated it, whence have no Greek MSS. till the 14th or 15th century, until the Codex of Montfort, the celebrated passage of the three witnesses in 1 John v. 7., which exists in several Latin Bibles and fathers? It had been, at least, worth while on account of its dogmatical importance, to have attempted some such thing in their own favour. But, if nothing of the sort was done by the ancients, how can it be said to happen in other passages, in which not even the remotest interest for a doctrine, or for particular favorite opinions can probably be involved?

One important doctrinal reading of genuine Latin origin is, *e. g.* John iii. 6., which occurs in Ter-

Jerome, who possessed a far greater insight into Biblical literature, did not think more favourably of them, as we shall hereafter see.

When, therefore, this ecclesiastical teacher held a commission from Damasus, to improve one of these Latin versions, which should be recommended for general use, he adopted for this end only THOSE ANCIENT GREEK MSS. WHICH WERE NOT WIDELY DIFFERENT FROM THE COMMON TEXT OF THE LATINS [n]. This last document would be, indeed, sufficient to certify us, that these codices must have been those, which we call *Codices Latinizantes*, even had he not added the words ANCIENT GREEK MSS., by which he thinks proper to designate them. But the word ANCIENT still further informs us, that they were no copies of the amended text, which were in circulation hardly eighty years before this father.

Since then, the κοινη ἐκδοσις had no rivals in the west, in the days of Jerome, and was even confirmed in its exclusive possession by Pope Gelasius towards the end of the fifth century, by a decree, we are in need of no further explanation, how, after it had ceased to be circulated generally, it has reached us in a MS. of an age, which by no means attained the fifth century: how it has been preserved by the side of a Latin version, in a MS. of Italian origin, or of the southern parts of France, viz. in the Cambridge codex.

From these remarks, we shall be able to make a still more extended prognosis of all that we have to expect from the different Græco-Latin MSS., which are still extant, among which one valuable codex of the four Gospels is known to me, which at present is replunged into a deep concealment, until it shall be

[n] Epistola ad Damas. codicum Græcorum collatione, sed veterum, quæ non multum à lectionis Latinæ consuetudine discreparent.

destined to come to light in a country visited with a less terrible fate. I had purposed to have made particular additions to the history of the text from it; but the events of the last years have more than annihilated all my hopes of this sort.

SECTION XXIX.

THERE are yet some MSS. of more recent date among our critical stock, which in a very great degree accord with the Cambridge codex, or with those which are much like to it, such as B and L. These MSS. are Wets. 1. or Basil vi. 27., a copy of the four Gospels of the tenth century; the other parts of the New Testament, which are bound up in it, do not belong to this date. Also, Wets. 13. or Codex reg. 2244. of the Gospels, called likewise KÜSTERO-PARISIN. 6. of the thirteenth century, and Wets. 69. in the library at Leicester, of the fourteenth century, also Griesbach. 124, or a Vienna MS. *Lambec.* 31. of the twelfth century, which contains the Gospels.

These MSS. are mostly written at that period, in which the Latin version might have had an influence on the state of the Greek text, which, as we have seen, it really had. There is, therefore, a strong suspicion, that they are CODICES LATINIZANTES, and that their similarity to D might at a later period have been restored, by inserting in them those readings from the Latin Bibles, which they originally possessed from the κοινη ἐκδοσις, of which they were a version.

1.—There are in these MSS., viz. in 1. 13. 69. 124., some very ancient readings, which occur no where else. In Matt. xv. 6., Cod. 13 and 124. read ἠκυρωσατε τον νομον του Θεου, as Ptolemy expressed the passage in the twelfth century in the Epistle to

Flora (n. 2.). In Luke vi. 29. it has the very singular reading, στρεψον αὐτῳ και την ἀλλην (Ep. ad Flor. n. 4.) in its text, which is only to be found in 69 and 124. Porphyry upbraided Matthew with ignorance for imputing the quotation in C. xiii. 35. to Isaiah *.—Of the MSS. still extant, only 1. 13. 33. 124., and M[t]. 10 read δια Ἡσαιου του προφητου. In Mark viii. 31. the Peschito and Justin Martyr (Dial. cum Tryph. c. 76. and 100.) have given τῃ τριτῃ ἡμερᾳ ἀναστηναι, like 1. 13. 69. 124. In Luke vi. 36. Justin read, οἰκτηρμονες, ὡς και ὁ Πατηρ ὑμων ὁ οὐρανιος (Dial. cum Tryph. c. 96.) like 13. 69. 124. Marcion read in Luke xix. 26., και ὁ δοκει ἐχειν ἀρθησεται, so does Codex 69.

2.—Many readings, which we find in none of the older and in few of the more recent MSS., agree with Origen alone. This principally, is the case with Codex 1. or Basil. B. vi. 27., which (to say nothing of its date, for it was written in the tenth century, during the schism of the Greeks) was not liable to the reproach of being a CODEX LATINIZANS: it however is not often the case with the others. Hence, it is now incumbent on me to prove this, with respect to the Basil MSS., for the sake of removing from it the possible suspicion of being a CODEX LATINIZANS. For this end I have only selected such readings, as alone have something in common with the MSS. already enumerated, or merely with one or other of the more recent MSS. The passages here exhibited are collected from the works of Origen, and consequently require no greater proof.

In Matt. vi. 25. the words, και τι πιητε are omitted in our Codex, which was the case in that of Clemens

* Evangelista vester Matthæus tàm imperitus fuit, ut diceret; quod scriptum est per Isaiam prophetam, &c.—Hieronym. Comment. in Ps. 77.

Alexandrinus and Justin. In Matt. vii. 28. it reads παντες οἱ ὀχλοι· in viii. 8. it omits ὁ παις μου· in x. 23. it and 13. 124. read φευγετε εἰς την ἑτεραν, κἀν ἐκ ταυτης διωκωσιν ὑμας, φευγετε εἰς την ἀλλην· in xiii. 36. εἰς την οἰκιαν αὐτου· in xiii. 52. ὁστις προφερει ἐκ του θησαυρου· in xiv. 36. ἱνα κἀν μονον·—like Cod. 13. and 33.—in xv. 11. it wants κοινοῖ τον ἀνθρωπον· it reads in xv. 22. δεινως δαιμονιζεται, in xvi. 12. ἀπο των ἀρτων, ἀλλ' ἀπο, in xvi. 19. ὁσα ἀν δησῃς, ... δεδεμενα, ... και ὁσα ἀν λυσῃς, ... λελυμενα: in xviii. 8. βληθηναι εἰς την γεενναν του πυρος· in xviii. 10. after ἀγγελοι αὐτων it wants ἐν οὐρανοις, like Cod. 13. In xviii. 17. it reads ἐστο σοι το λοιπον· in xviii. 25. it omits ὁ Κυριος αὐτου· in xviii. 27. for το δανειον it substitutes πασαν την ὀφειλην· in xix. 29. for ἠ πατερα, ἠ μητερα it substitutes ἠ γονεις· in xxi. 13. it reads πεποιηκατε σπηλαιον· in xxii. 7. it writes ἀνειλε for ἀπωλεσε· in xxii. 16. it reads προσωπον ἀνθρωπου, and in xxiv. 48. Κυριος μου ἐρχεσθαι. These readings, which we have here extracted from the Gospel of Matthew, which our Codex contains for the most part exclusively, without the agreement of any other, all occur to us again in the works of Origen, all of which nearly were composed, before this father executed his recension of the text. They are therefore certainly old, and as to their origin, they are coeval with the κοινη ἐκδοσις.

3.—We meet with many of the peculiar readings of this MS. in the Peschito: this is more especially the case with the MSS. 13. 69. 124. of which we here give examples. In Matt. xiv. 7. the MSS. 13. and 124. read ὠμοσεν for ὡμολογησεν· in xiv. 24. ἠδη σταδιους πολλους ἀπο της γης ἀπειχεν (13. 124.)—xvi. 27. for κατα την πραξιν, MSS. 1. and 124. have κατα τα ἐργα· xxi. 26. εἰχον for ἐχουσι· xxii. 37. διανοιᾳ σου, και ἐν ὁλῃ τῃ ἰσχυϊ σου· 13. 69. 124.—Mark viii. 29. ὁ Χριστος, ὁ υἱος του Θεου ζωντος· 13. 69. 124.—ix. 11. πως οὐν λεγουσιν·

13. 69. 124.—ix. 34. εν τη οδφ, τις αυτων μειζων ειη· 13. 69.—xi. 13. ηλθεν εις αυτην, ει αρα· 69. 124.—xii. 6. υστερον δε ετι for ετι ουν· 13. 69. 124.—xiv. 64. βλασφημιας του στοματος αυτου, 13. 69. 124.—xiv. 67. ιδουσα αυτον for ιδουσα τον Πετρον· 1. 69.—xv. 6. κατα την εορτην ειωθει ο ηγεμων απολυειν· 13. 69. 124.

4.—We perceive still more of their peculiarities in Egypt, in the Thebaïc or Memphitic version, or in the Alexandrine MS. in the monastery of the Antonians, from which Thomas of Charkel made extracts.

According to these specimens, our MSS. contain no text, which is composed of more recent materials, or which has received this form from the blunders and caprice of later transcribers, which lie in disorder one among other, but that for which they are distinguished, partly consists of very ancient readings. If they be still further distinguished by the near accordance of their text with the Codex D and its rare readings, we should rather conjecture, that this agreement originated in ancient times, than that it was latterly affected by the Latin versions, at a period, when those Latin versions, which contained these readings, viz. those antecedent to Jerome, were only preserved here and there, as curious copies, which were supplanted by a textus receptus, and were no longer in circulation.

The suspicion, therefore, can only be attached to those passages, which have a striking resemblance to the Latin text of Jerome, or Alcuinus. Now were I freely to concede some such a thing, with regard to those MSS. which were written at the time of the reconciliation between the Latins and Greeks, viz. in the 12th century, and afterwards, which is the case with the MSS. 13. 69. and 124., yet on the whole the result would remain to me, that, with the

exception of these passages, they display a very ancient text, probably that of Codex D, in fact, that they display the κοινη ἐκδοσις.

I now may explain, how in later times, after the κοινη ἐκδοσις was disused, transcripts of it were made, from the *librarii*, who had no further idea of an amended text, eagerly laying hold of these MSS. for the sake of transcribing those, which recommended themselves by their venerable appearance and marks of great age.

Yet I have to remark, in conclusion, that Cod. 124. harmonizes more than the rest with the old Syriac version, and with a recension, which was published from MSS. of the Syrian κοινη ἐκδοσις.

SECTION XXX.

Now, if the Cambridge MS. gives to us a copy of the κοινη ἐκδοσις of the Gospels, we may possibly expect the same from it in the Acts of the Apostles. Its text in this book is, indeed, very like to its text of the Gospels: here it just as much differs from the common routine of MSS., and contains just as many remarks and glosses of learned and unlearned men, every where disclosing, that many persons had been employed to communicate something to it, and to place it in a state of rather having a certain similarity to all, than of a MS., which (if it be examined according to the rules of criticism) is purified and emended from foreign additions.

The Codex of Archbishop William Laud of Canterbury has the most evident resemblance to this book: it most probably once belonged to the Venerable Bede, and now is preserved at Oxford in the

Bodleian library. It contains the Acts of the Apostles, and bears the mark of E among their MSS.

One of those MSS., which Thomas of Charkel found at Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century, among the antiquities of the monastery of the Antonians, and collated with the margin of the Philoxenian version, had a similar character.

To which may be added an ancient Ægyptian version in the Thebaic dialect, probably the most ancient of this country.

These four documents are those, which exhibit to us the κοινη ἐκδοσις of Ægypt and the West, as far as it relates to the Acts of the Apostles.

But the Peschito or Church version of the Syrians describes (at least as well as a single document can describe it) the text, as it was constituted in another Land, as it was constituted in Syria, during this period.

This view is the natural consequence of our preceding assertions respecting the κοινη ἐκδοσις of the Gospels. As far as that assertion stands or falls, this is involved in its fate. Yet we have some additional proofs at hand, on which we may particularly ground this assumption with regard to the Acts of the Apostles.

The ancient Fathers of the Church did not nearly so often quote this book as the Gospels. These main documents of Christianity were more rich in information, and in materials for moral, dogmatical, and positive discourses in general and even for polemical purposes. Hence, Justin, Theophilus of Antioch, and even Clemens Alexandrinus, very seldom made use of the Acts of the Apostles: the same was also the case with Origen, a very voluminous writer. The arrangement of the controversy and the plan, which Irenæus followed, conducted him more frequently

than the rest of the ancients to this treatise: yet, unluckily, we have scarcely the tenth part of his hæresiological works in the original language; time has destroyed the rest, and only left to us a Latin translation. Yet can we sometimes still perceive from the context, what was the reading in his copy of the Acts of the Apostles. But this fortunate secondary aid is not so frequently serviceable to us as we wish and stand in need of it.

If we may judge from the Latin translation, Irenæus had, instead of τας ὠδινας του θανατου—τας ὠδινας του ἅδου in his Biblical MS. at Acts ii. 24. We may not indeed determine from the context, that the translator so found it in the original; but Polycarp, an older Father of the Church, thus quotes the passage in the Epistle to the Philippians; and so it stands in D[p]. The Father's Greek phrase in Acts iv. 31., is yet in existence, according to which, after μετα παῤῥησιας, he had in his copy [q], παντι τῳ θελοντι πιστευειν, which is the reading both in D and E. In Acts viii. 36. Codex E has after τι κωλυει με βαπτισθηναι, the words εἰπε δε αὐτῳ ὁ Φιλιππος· ἐαν πιστευεις ἐξ ὁλης της καρδιας σου, σωθηση· ἀποκριθεις δε εἰπε· πιστευω εἰς τον Χριστον, τον υἱον του Θεου. Thomas of Charkel met with something similar in his old Alexandrine copy: D wants it. Yet, a free quotation of Irenæus, of which the Greek words have survived, shews this addition to have existed in his Acts of the Apostles, ὡς αὐτος εὐνουχος (he says) πεισθεις, και παραυτικα ἀξιων βαπτισθηναι, ἐλεγε· πιστευω τον υἱον του Θεου εἰναι Ἰησουν Χριστον[r]. In Acts xiv. 10. D, and another ancient MS., add after φωνη ;—σοι λεγω ἐν τῳ ὀνοματι του Κυριου Ἰησου Χριστου,

[p] Lib. iii. adv. Hæres. c. 12. n. 2. Polycarp. § 2.
[q] L. iii. adv. Hær. c. 12. n. 5.
[r] Ibid. n. 8.

where he had πασαν την σοφιαν in one of his copies, as D has it [y].

Since greater and more express quotations from the Acts of the Apostles rarely occur in the works of the ancients, it is by so much the more worthy of remark, that these small quotations exhibit so many and such important variations, in which D, E, and the MS. of the Antonians at Alexandria, almost always invariably accord with them. The uniformity in remarkable readings, which is so strikingly distinguishable in the few remains of the one part, induces the fair presumption, that besides what we have perceived, the whole of both would be found equally similar, could we unexpectedly recover it.

SECTION XXXI.

THE following observations present themselves to our present design of collecting from the preceding documents a short sketch of the history of the text, as far as it relates to the Acts of the Apostles.

1. Expressions more familiar and intelligible were substituted for some few, which were less prevalent or obscure; a difficult passage was either assisted by the insertion of a word, or by a slight alteration.

2. Frequently those circumstances, which convey their own interpretation, and which a concise historical style neglects, are filled up by an interpolation: thus, that conveys its own meaning, which D and the MS. of the Antonians add (Acts v.22.) after παραγενομενοι; viz. και ανοιξαντες την φυλακην; or (Acts xiv. 2.) which the copy, from which the Peschito was made, has added after επηγειραν—τα εθνη, ινα κακωσουσι τους αδελφους,—και εκακωσαν τας..... So in Acts xxii. 26.,

[y] Strom. l. i. c. 23.

the passage which in D follows ὁ ἑκατονταρχος. viz. ὁτι Ῥωμαιον ἑαυτον λεγει, is contained in the verse collectively.

3. Sometimes real historical circumstances or supplements were added. As, *e. g.* the Syriac κοινη ἐκδοσις distinguishes Ἡρωδης ὁ βασιλευς in Acts xii. 1. from others of this name, by ὁ ἐπικαλουμενος Ἀγριππας. Thus, the MS. of the Antonians remarks, (Acts xii. 5.) that Peter was not guarded by a Roman escort, but ὑπο της σπειρης του βασιλεως. In the same chapter x. 10., a circumstance is mentioned relative to the prison, which is elsewhere traditionally preserved, viz. και ἐξελθοντες,—κατεβησαν τους ἑπτα βαθμους,—προηλθον ῥυμην, so likewise it stands in D.

4. We may presume, that very early legends concerning illustrious men of the first days of Christianity were brought together. This supposition will explain the remarkable instances, which may be seen in the narratives of Cornelius the Centurion, and Aquilas. The κοινη ἐκδοσις, for instance, has added circumstances to them, which might have been taken from these legends, and marked at first on the margin of the Acts of the Apostles, and then inserted by Librarii into the text. There is an example concerning Aquilas in D and the Codex of the Antonians, Acts xviii. 27. ἐν δε τῃ Ἐφεσῳ ἐπιδημουντες τινες Κορινθιοι, και ἀκουσαντες αὐτου, παρεκαλουν συνελθειν συν αὐτοις εἰς την πατριδα αὐτων, συγκατανευσαντος δε αὐτου, οἱ Ἐφεσιοι ἐγραψαν τοις ἐν Κορινθῳ μαθηταις, ὁπως ἀποδεξωνται τον ἀνδρα, ὁς ἐπιδημησας εἰς την Ἀχαϊαν, πολυ συνεβαλλετο ἐν ταις ἐκκλησιαις. In these two MSS. may also be found something similar concerning Cornelius in Acts x. 24. xi. 1.

5. Wherever there was an opportunity, passages from other Biblical writings of the Old or New Testament were transplanted into this book, as they had been into the Gospels; but the opportunity was not

in this case as frequent as it had been in the other. In Acts vii. 24. after τον Αἰγυπτιον,—και ἐκρυψεν ἐν τῳ ἀμμῳ is added from Exodus ii. 12. So is it in D. There is also a like instance in E in Acts vii. 3. with which Cf. Gen. xii. 1. The addition in Acts xv. 20. is borrowed from Matt. vii. 12. και ὁσα μη θελουσιν ἑαυτοις γινεσθαι, ἑτεροις μη ποιειτε. D.

6. The misplaced passages which existed in this book in consequence of the lessons of the Church, are numerous. We will not unnecessarily multiply vouchers of this assertion, two examples shall therefore illustrate it. The beginning of a Church lesson was Acts iii. 1. and Acts v. 1., hence, we find in D at the first of these lessons, the brief commencing formulary, ἐν δε ταις ἡμεραις ταυταις· inserted into the text; the second occasioned a similar interpolation in E: ἐν αὐτῳ δε τῳ καιρῳ ἀνηρ τις Ἀνανιας.....

Mostly of this sort are the different varieties of corruptions; but the number of particular instances comprehended under them, is much greater in this book, than in each of the Evangelists. Some of them are of so great an extent, that the MSS. of the Gospels, the well-known passage in Matt. xx. 28. being omitted, have nothing of the sort to shew. The Acts of the Apostles therefore is the book which, of all the New Testament, is the best calculated to guide us in that epoch of which we are treating.

It was the least arbitrarily disfigured in Syria:—at least the Peschito, which now is our only standard of judgment on this point, does not contain such numerous or such extensive variations. The few casual occurrences, with which it then had to do, on which we have before made our remarks (§. 26.) satisfy us perfectly with respect to this book and its gentler fate.

But other additions awaited the Acts of the

Apostles in Egypt and its principal city of that period, the influence of which was in a remarkable degree more prejudicial. Yet all the documents which come, from thence were not exposed to similar propensities: there was a difference between them, such as might be expected at this epoch, in which each individual improvidently, added glosses to his Codex.

The Cod. Laud. or E. of the Acts of the Apostles contains a purer text than D. We often find variations from the first, which fundamentally exist in D, and in a still more extended state: thus, after οὐ δυνησεσθε καταλυσαι αὐτους, Acts v. iii. 39., E adds οὐτε ὑμεις, οὐτε οἱ ἀρχοντες ὑμων; this addition D thus extends, οὐτε ὑμεις, οὐτε οἱ βασιλεις, οὐτε τυραννοι, ἀπεχεσθε οὐν ἀπο των ἀνθρωπων τουτων, μηποτε.... or Acts xiii. 43. where after χαριτι του Θεου, E proceeds ἐγενετο δε κατα πασαν πολιν φημισθηναι τον λογον. D, however, adds still further, ἐγενετο δε καθ' ὁλης της πολεως διελθειν τον λογον του Θεου.

Yet, much as they resemble each other in other respects, the MS. which Thomas of Charkel found and collated in the monastery of the Antonians, was still more disfigured than D. Wetstein supposed the MS. of the Antonians to have been the same as that which is now at Cambridge; but this intelligent man at that time had their mutual correspondence so forcibly present to him, that he forgot how much more abundant in peculiar readings the Alexandrine Codex was than this MS.

Since the readings of the MS. E frequently fundamentally exist in D, in which they are more extended, we shall commit no precipitate mistake in considering the text of E as the more ancient, even if the transcript, by means of which it has reached us, be not so old as D. But the text of this last MS., and of that which the Antonians possessed, affords to us no such criteria for arguing in favour of the priority of

the one or of the other: for the great or little, the more considerable or more unimportant corruption separately considered (since that depends on accidental possessors and their propensity to add glosses), determines nothing as to an earlier or later age.

SECTION XXXII.

HAVING once engaged in these researches, however dry and gloomy be their external appearance, we must yet prepare ourselves not to deny to them that due share of our attention, until we have entirely unfolded them. I have endeavoured to exhibit them, as simply as possible, and have in general confined myself to that which is most necessary, for the sake not of drawing these inquiries by an unseasonable profusion of learning, more into obscurity, but of elucidating and establishing them.

We shall again, first of all, be forced to inquire, whether MSS. of Paul's Epistles have been preserved which exhibit their κοινη ἐκδοσις, and which they are? It is natural for us again to consult that writer of the period on which we are here entering, who, by the greater compass of his works, is particularly calculated to illustrate a fact, which can only be disclosed by a collation of several quotations.

Clemens Alexandrinus agrees with the MSS. A.B.C. and D.E.F.G., which are nearly related to each other. Where both parts harmonize, which is frequently the case, he is ordinarily on their side. But these two classes of MSS., however they may often accord with each other, have yet on the whole a very different character.

For, A.B.C. preserve a revised text, which we

in which D.E.F.G. are abandoned by all ancient MSS., and generally also by more recent MSS., in which they are yet accompanied by Clemens.

In the Epistle to the Romans, iii. 26., there is a slight peculiarity, which only occurs in D and Clemens, which, however, gives a totally different turn to the passage: both read τον ἐκ πιστεως Ἰησουν [a]. In Rom. v. 12. for ἀνθρωπους ὁ θανατος διηλθεν, Clemens reads ἀνθρωπους διηλθεν [a], as well as D.E.F.G. without θανατος. In Rom. x. 21., Clemens transposes ἐξεπετασα τας χειρας μου ὁλην την ἡμεραν· thus far, he stands alone: he then says, ἐπι λαον ἀπειθ.—in which D.E. agree with him [b]. In Rom. xiv. 6., οὐν ἡμων το ἀγαθ.... Clemens and D.E.F.[c] In the Pædagogus, where he sometimes expresses other readings than in the rest of his writings, where he consequently followed another exemplar, he read 1 Cor. x. 5. for ἀδελφην, γυναικα, περιαγειν, —γυναικας [d], as the Latins, Tertullian, and others, *mulieres, uxores:* D has also the reading γυναικας. In 1 Cor. ix. 22., ἱνα παντως τινας he quotes ἱνα παντας, as D.E.F.G. read it [e]; and at vers. 27. ὑποπιεζω [f], as D.E.; in 1 Cor. xii. 10. he has διακρισις in the singular number, in which G alone accords with him [g]. He reads 1 Cor. xiii. 12. with D.E.F.G. βλεπομεν ἀρτι, and with D ὡς δι' ἐσοπτρου [h]. In 1 Cor. xiv. 11. he has the same, as

[a] Pædag. l. i. p. 119. Heins. et Sylb. Paris, 1641, or p. 141. ed Venet.

[a] L. iii. Strom. c. 9.

[b] L. ii. Strom. c. 9.

[c] L. ii. Pædagog. p. 142. Sylb. 165. Venet.

[d] L. ii. Pædagog. p. 144. Sylb. 169. Venet.

[e] L. v. Strom. c. 3.

[f] L. iii. Strom. c. 16.

[g] L. iv. Strom. c. 21.

[h] L. i. Strom. c. 19., l. v. Strom. c. 1. Pædagog., l. i. p. 99. Sylb. and 120 Venet.

steps into his place, and informs us by means of his agreement with them, that these MSS. are very like to the oldest Alexandrine text. An Egyptian version likewise, (viz. the Thebaïc,) approaches very closely to these MSS. in the few fragments, which we have of it.

Yet, although Clemens, taken on the whole, evidently inclines to them, he nevertheless differs from them in very considerable variations, and gives to us different readings, with which we no where else meet. I therefore will produce some examples, which consist of such long quotations, as could not well have been given *memoriter*, such as Gal. iii. 26., where he read thus, παντες γαρ υἱοι ἐστε δια πιστεως Θεου ἐν Χριστῳ Ἰησου [x]. Eph. vi. 9., εὐ ποιειτε τους οἰκητας ὑμων, ἀνιεντες την ἀπειλην [y]. Eph. v. 25. οἱ ἀνδρες τας γυναικας τας ἑαυτων ἀγαπατωσαν, as at v. 22. where he had read with Codex A ὑποτασσεσθωσαν [z]. At Rom. xii. 13. he changes the order, την φιλοξ.—διωκ.—ταις χρ. των ἁγ. κοιν.—[a]. Also in 1 Cor. i. 21. δια κηρυγματος της μωριας σωσαι[b]. In Rom. xv. 4. he is still more singular: και της παρακλησεως των γραφων την ἐλπιδα ἐχωμεν της παρακλησεως[c]; there is something in this, which we more easily conceive a citation from memory. But, this conjecture may be less allowed in 1 Thess. v. 7., οἱ μεθυοντες νυκτος μεθυσκονται[d]. Some smaller readings also, which we briefly call to mind, are remarkable, *e. g.* Eph. ii. 3., where he now only

[x] Pæd. l. i. p. 95-96. Sylb. 116. Venet.
[y] Pæd. l. iii. p. 263. Sylb. 308. Venet.
[z] Pæd. l. iii. c. i.
[a] Pæd. l. iii. 264. S. 309. Venet.
[b] Strom. l. i. c. 18.
[c] Strom. l. iv. c. 5.
[d] Pæd. l. ii. 186. S. 218. Venet.

omits the word φυσει; or 2 Cor. vi. 16., where for ειπεν ὁ Θεος, he read ειπεν ὁ προφητης [e], &c.

The MSS. D. E. F. G., therefore, might indeed exhibit a text nearly allied to the Alexandrine or Egyptian; but their agreement is not sufficiently great to exhibit it with fulness.

Had the migration of these MSS. to the West any influence on their text, and did it often cause a gloss and supposed emendation, which they formerly had not? I have no doubt on the subject: Irenæus, in the few places where the original Greek has survived, or where from the context and his inferences we can judge what he had in his copy of the Bible, concurs with the readings of these MSS.; *e. g.* Rom. xi. 32., where he expresses παντα εἰς ἀπειθειαν, as D. E. F. G. [f]; or Rom. v. 19., where he also reads ὑπακοης του ἑνος ἀνθρωπου [g], with D. F. G.; also 1 Tim. i. 4., where both himself and D have οἰκοδομην [h]. In 1 Cor. xv. 56., he read που σου, θανατε, το νικος; που σου, θανατε, το κεντρον; he then comments upon the words, and the whole of his expositions are in favour of θανατος alone [i]; so we also find it in D. E. F. G. In Gal. iii. 19. F. G., read τι οὐν ὁ νομος των πραξεων; ἐτεθη ἀχρις...., where the common text has τι οὐν ὁ νομος; των παραβασεων χαριν ἐτεθη ἀχρις.... In Irenæus it is quoted in the Latin only, as in F. G.; but when we consider his reasoning upon it, it is evident that he had not χαριν in his Bible, and very probable, that he read πραξεων for παραβασεων [k].

[e] Cohort. ad Gent. 16. S. 23. Venet. Strom. l. iii. c. 11.
[f] L. i. adv. Hær. c. 10. n. 3., L. iii. c. 20, n. 2.
[g] Fragm. ex Catenâ in Luc. p. 347. Ven. et Massuet.
[h] Prolog. in L. i. adv. Hær.
[i] L. iii. c. 23. n. 7.
[k] L. iii. adv. Hær. c. 7. n. 2.

We might still further establish it also, from the readings of Marcion, if indeed he composed his Apostolicon among the Westerns. The passage in 1 Cor. x. 19., as he read it, ὁτι ἱεροθυτον τι ἐστιν, ἡ εἰδωλοθυτον τι ἐστιν, approaches nearest to MSS. F. G. In 1 Cor. xv. 50., he has simply expressed κληρονομησειν οὐ δυναναι by οὐ κληρονομησουσι, as F. G., and 2 Cor. v. 3. και ἐκδυσαμενοι, οὐ γυμνοι, as D. F. G. In the well-known passage (Gal. ii. 5.) οἰς οὐδε προς ὡραν εἰξαμεν, he omits the οἰς οὐδε, like Codex D. In Gal. v. 9., he read το φυραμα δυλοῖ, as D.E., and in Gal. v. 14. he has omitted ἐν τῳ before ἀγαπησεις, as D. F. G. The readings appear again altogether in the Latin Fathers, as well as another reading of this Father (on account of which he has been censured) which no longer exists in any MS. It is in 1 Cor. xiv. 9., and to all appearance it is merely an ancient error of transcription: for he read δια του νομου instead of δια του νοος μου. From such copies indeed the Latin versions proceeded, which the Teachers of the Church used; yet shall we with difficulty be persuaded to reverse the case, and to assert, that Marcion interpolated his Apostolicon from the versions of the Latins, even if these were in existence. The Latin Fathers, in whom we again find these readings, are not simply from Italy alone, or Gaul, but principally from Africa, which is an observation very important to the history of the text. All the readings in D. E. F. G., which do not occur in Clemens or Origen, are not simply on this account to be pronounced not of African origin.

Even if we would attribute to the Westerns far too great a share in the condition of these MSS., we may very easily be directed right by the oldest Syriac version, which contains a considerable number of these uncommon readings, which are to be found in no copies, excepting in the MSS. D.E.F.G.

From all which, the following conclusion appears to me deducible that D.E.F.G. contain a very ancient text of the period of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, which very closely agreed with the Alexandrine and Egyptian, which passed westwards to the coast of Africa, and was afterwards introduced among the Latins in Italy and Gaul.

SECTION XXXIII.

If this be right, we might now produce some traits of these MSS. for the sake of forming the picture of the text in that age, in which it was most freely treated, as far as it relates to the Epistles of Paul.

We might here begin with the agreeable remark, that the Epistles of the Apostle have not suffered so much, as the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Didactic writings, which were composed in a straightforward succession of ideas, and which maintain their connexion by a close union of passages, do not so easily afford opportunity for the interpolations and glosses of others, and should they even be introduced, they must soon betray themselves by the interruptions which they cause. But historical compositions, which often stand isolated and free, and are united by no internal connection, afford an open field to greater as well as smaller insertions.

The discrepancies of the κοινη ἐκδοσις in Syria, and of that in Africa, are not by far so great as in the historical writings: and here likewise the assertion, that the Syriac is somewhat purer than the western African, is in full force.

1. The species of variations, which occur in Paul's Epistles, are in other respects nearly the same as in

the other writings. Hebraisms have been destroyed, *e. g.* Rom. xiii. 1., *πασα ψυχη εξουσ.—υποτασσεσθω*, כל נפש which D. E. F. G. have thus altered, *πασαις εξουσιας . . . υποτασσεσθε* in 2 Thess. i. 8. *εν πυρι φλογος*, באש להב *εν φλογι πυρος* Phil. ii. 14., *χωρις γογγυσμων*, G *χωρις οργης*.

2. A greater Grecian turn, a greater degree of elegance was given to harsher passages. Phil. iii. 13., *εμαυτον ου λογιζομαι κατειληφοτα*, F. G.; Gal. iv. 25., *εν τη Αραβια, η συστοιχουσα δουλευει*, D. F. G. Eph. ii. 11. *δια τουτο μνημονευοντες υμεις, οι ποτε*, F. G.; Col. i. 26., *το μυστηριον το αποκεκρυμμενον. . . . νυνι δε φανερωθεν*. D. E., &c.

3. A less common expression was exchanged for one more familiar. 2 Cor. xii. 13., *ηττηθητε υπερ τας . . . ησσωθητε παρα . . .* D. E. Rom. iii. 9., *προεχομεθα*, D. G. *προκατεχομεν περισσον*: Rom. xii. 9., *αποστυγουντες*, G *μισουντες*. Or they at least wrote this on the margin, when they did not strike out the other. In Gal. iv. 21., *τον νομον ουκ ακουετε* some one wrote by the side of *ακουετε*,—*αναγινωσκετε*, as it occurs in D. E. F. G. This substitution must be very old; for it was united in the third century with the original expression in a compound reading, as it appears in Origen's 2nd book, 3rd §., against Celsus, *οι τον νομον αναγινωσκοντες, τον νομον ουκ ακουετε*. It is pleasing to perceive the manner in which from one various reading soon a second proceeds, and a great one from a small one. This is the case in Col. ii. 15., where some one substituted *την σαρκα* for *τας αρχας*, as we may see it in F.G., or which seems to me more probable, that in transcribing ΤΗΝΣΑΡΚΑ—he changed it into ΤΑΣΑΡΧΑΣ: the translator of the Peschito found both readings marked in his copy, and united them with a third: *την σαρκα, τας αρχας και εξουσιας*.

4. Some frequently inserted an expression, to elu-

cidate a passage which was somewhat obscure. In 1 Cor. xii. 24., the passage appears to acquire more light, when τιμης is added after χρειαν ἐχει, as in D. E. F. G. and the Peschito. In Phil. iii. 18., the Peschito inserts ἑτερως after περιπατουσι: in the same Epistle, iv. 18, F. and G. illustrate τα παρ' ἡμας by adjoining πεμφθεντα, or Col. iv. 9. παντα ὑμιν γνωριουσι τα ὡδε by adding πραττομενα. So likewise F. and G. assist Gal. v. 24., by ὀντες after Χριστου, and by αὐτων after σαρκα.

5. They inserted into the text parallel passages, or readings, which had been written on the margin, from other Epistles. In Gal. iv. 17. after ἱνα αὐτους ζηλουτε,—ζηλουτε δε τα κρειττονα χαρισματα occurs in the MSS. D. E. F. G. from 1 Cor. xii. 31., and in 1 Tim. vi. 9. after παγιδα, the addition του Διαβολου is transferred from the same Epistle iii. 7. in D. F. G. F. G. after σπερμα σου, Rom. iv. 18. received the addition, ὡς οἱ ἀστερες του οὐρανου, και το ἀμμον της θαλασσης, from the Old Testament (Gen. xxii. 17.) Various readings in the LXX. likewise afforded materials for alteration, an example of which is in the Peschito, in Rom. ix. 25. και την ἠλεημενην, ἠλεημενην· or 1 Cor. ix. 9. κημωσεις for φιμωσεις in D. F. G.

6. A species of alteration still occurs in the Epistles, which is peculiar to them: viz. transpositions of constructions and words, which were purposely arranged to bring to an easier point of view the long periods or passages of the Apostle interrupted by parentheses, by means of another disposition of them. In Rom. xvi. 3. the words, και την κατ' οἰκον αὐτων ἐκκλησιαν, which were separated by the whole parenthesis, οἱτινες as far as των ἐθνων from the principal subject, were transferred to them from verse 5, and were joined to συνεργ. μου ἐν Χριστῳ Ἰησου in D. E. F. G. In 2 Cor. xii. 21., where προς ὑμας were disjoined from ἐλθοντα με by the words ταπεινωσῃ

ὁ Θεος μου by means of a very harsh arrangement of words, they were united in the MSS. D. E. F. G. In 1 Cor. xiv. 34. Paul interrupts the admonitions respecting prophetic gifts, by the well-known commandment, that women should be silent in the Church; and then, having enjoined this by means of two parentheses, he reverts at v. 37. to prophesying. These rapid transitions divert the reader's mind from a consecutive chain of ideas, and render it very difficult to the unpractised again to find the connection: hence, the MSS. D. E. F. G. separated the passages in v. 34, 35.. αι γυναικες ὑμων as far as ἐν ἐκκλησιᾳ λαλειν from their ancient context, and placed them after v. 40. following κατα ταξιν γινεσθω.

Lastly, no one can be surprised, that the text in its passage to the Latins should have sometimes suffered from inadequate copyists and unskilful correctors. In Eph. v. 5. ὁς ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρης—some one wishing to accommodate the Greek to the Latin termination *Idololatra* wrote it ὁς ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεια, until ὁς was at length changed into ὁ, as it stands in F. G. or Gal. ii. 7. πεπιστευμαι το εὐαγγελιον *creditum est mihi Evangelium*, πεπιστευται μοι το εὐαγγελιον, F. G. and Phil. iv. 3. γνησιε, γερμανε, συζυγε. F. G.

Which of our MSS. of the κοινη ἐκδοσις has a more ancient text, I think it very difficult to determine; although D. E. were not subjected to so many alterations, as F. G. Yet, in my opinion, it is more than barely probable, that a great portion of those additions and alterations, which were made in Codex D. *à secundâ manú*, were taken from G. or F., or rather had been derived from an older MS., from which the western *Librarii* prepared the transcripts F. and G.

SECTION XXXIV.

We should now come in due order to the Catholic Epistles: but no MS. of them has survived, which has preserved the text of the κοινη ἐκδοσις. Some of them, indeed, were frequently quoted by the ancients: Clemens Alexandrinus has in different places cited nearly half of the first Epistle of Peter [l], whence we perceive that there much has also happened to these Epistles, *e. g.* 1 Pet. iii. 1. οἱτινες ἀπειθοι τῳ λογῳ, and v. 2. την ἐν λογῳ ἁγνην ἀναστροφην, iv. 3. ὁ παρεληλυθως χρονος το βουλημα των ἐθνων κατειργασθαι, iii. 16. ἱνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεισθε, καταισχυνθωσιν οἱ ἐπηρεαζοντες την καλην ἀναστροφην ὑμων ἐν Χριστῳ, κ. τ. λ., or Jude v. 5. ὁτι ὁ Θεος ἅπαξ ἐκ γης Αἰγυπτου λαον σωσας, and v. 7. ὑπο ζοφον ἀγριων ἀγγελων [m], from whence ἁγιων ἀγγελων, and *Sanctorum angelorum* in the old Latin versions afterwards arose. Yet all these quotations will probably only inform us, that the fate of these Epistles may have been nearly the same as those of Paul's, without further declaring to us the particular occurrences, which they may have experienced. We have to expect greater explanations concerning them from the Thebaic version, if ever it shall be executed as it deserves.

SECTION XXXV.

The same chance happened to the Apocalypse: no MS. of it likewise has been saved which makes us

[l] Cohort. ad Gent. p. 40. Sylb. 52. Venet. Pædagog. L. i. p. 103. Sylb. 124. Venet. L. iii. p. 244. 249-50. 253. 258-59. Sylb. Strom. L. iii. c. 11. c. 18. Strom. L. iv. c. 7. c. 20.

[m] Paed. L. iii. c. 8. p. 239. Sylb. 281. Venet.

acquainted with its fate in the first period. What however we know of it from other quarters, is very satisfactory. The κοινη ἐκδοσις, as we find it in the hands of the western teachers of this period, especially of those who lived farther within the third century, when it had reached the boundaries of its circulation among the Greeks, must have expressed the strong oppositions to the Apocalypse in the strongest manner, if it were exposed to them. But, if we consider this treatise, as it is quoted by Tertullian, and by Cyprian, who lived much later, it cannot be contradicted, that in part a very mild fate happened to it, in comparison with that among other people.

Its peculiar obscurity was, probably, one of the causes, which deprived many of the wish of glossing upon it, nor did the harsh accusations, which for a long time were raised against it, and the suspicion of spuriousness founded on these, contribute less to secure it from much detriment. It was but little read, and it was owing to this neglect, that it was in a better state, than those books to which the industry and application of many had been prejudicial.

The treatise of Hippolytus on Christ and Antichrist, which we certainly have reason to account genuine, is well adapted to elucidate our assertion. In it some chapters are extensively quoted, and the various readings which occur in it, can therefore afford to us an idea of the state of the whole.

In it we meet with slight transpositions, trifling differences in the flexion of words, and other dissimilarities of this kind: as to remarkable additions or alterations, we can only point out these, Apoc. xi. 5. θελησει ἀδικ.—and πυρ ἐξελευσεται:—at v. 7. he inserts the words τον δρομον αὐτων, και before την μαρτυριαν

αὐτου [n]. In Apoc. xii. 16. he reads ὀφις for δρακων after ἐβαλεν: — at v. 17. μετα των ἁγιων, for μετα των λοιπων [o]. Apoc. xvii. 7. he introduces του θηριου before του βασταζοντος:—v. 14. και βασιλευς των βασιλευοντων ἐστι [p]. Apoc. xviii. 2. ἰσχυρα φωνι μεγαλῃ:—v. 13. he adds after προβατα,—και τραγους: v. 19. for τιμιοτητος he makes use of πιοτητος, and v. 20. for οἱ ἁγιοι he uses οἱ ἀγγελοι [q]. The most considerable variation occurs at the commencement of the 21st ch., which he thus begins: και εἰδον σημειον μεγα και θαυμαστον, γυναικα περιβεβλημενην τον ἡλιον, κ. τ. λ [r]. Of this description are the passages, in which the illustrious pupil of Irenæus differs most widely from the common text, and also varies from the MSS. which are known. If we consider the copiousness of his Apocalyptical citations, and these unimportant variations, which distinguish them, we cannot complain of the boldness and presumption, with which the Apocalypse was treated in the epoch of the κοινη ἐκδοσις.

THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT.—THE SECOND EPOCH.

SECTION XXXVI.

This could not however long continue:—unless some fortunate undertaking had introduced order into the text, and placed limits to this licentiousness, within two centuries it would have been involved in a confusion beyond all precedent. It was perceived, that

[n] S. Hippolyt. Demonst. de Christo et Antichristo, c. 47.
[o] Ibm. c. 60.
[p] Ibm. c. 37, 38.
[q] Ibm. c. 41, 42.
[r] Ibm. c. 60.

this was the proper time, and the wish for a revision of the text was so general, that three individuals in different countries devoted themselves to this employment. And the benefit, which the Christian schools experienced from it, was actually so great, they have not deserved that forgetfulness, to which their noble labours have been consigned.

If the name of Origen be again occasionally mentioned in the criticism of the New Testament, yet is not his fame so solitary and peculiar, as to be without rivals. Hesychius and Lucian followed his steps, emulous of obtaining a portion of his fame from a juster age.

These were the three, who about the middle of the third century and immediately afterwards, attempted an emendation of the text and prepared new editions or recensions. That is, they collated several of the best and more ancient MSS., which were in their neighbourhood, to ascertain by this process, what in later times had been added to some of them, what had been changed or omitted in individual copies, and how far they agreed in an uniform text, which might be received, as a rule.

Hesychius had his department in Egypt. In this country and its metropolis his emendation obtained the public and ecclesiastical sanction[s]. The other circumstances of his life are entirely unknown: probably he is the person mentioned by Eusebius among the Egyptian Bishops, who perished in the persecution of Diocletian[t].

[s] Alexandria et Ægyptus ejus opus amplexi sunt. Hier. Præf. in Par. et L. ii. adv. Ruffin. c. 26.

[t] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. vii. c. 15. Fabric. Bib. Græc. L. iv. c. 13. Hamb.

Lucian, surnamed the Martyr, famed for his acumen, and particularly for his knowledge of Biblical literature, was a Presbyter of Antioch in Syria. He perished at Nicodemia in the persecution of Maximin [w], or, as others say, under Maximinian and Diocletian, and had his tomb at Helenopolis in Bithynia.

His emendation was adopted from Syria, all over Asia Minor, it extended beyond the Bosphorus, and was received in Thrace, and at Byzantium, the subsequent metropolis of the Roman empire. His authority was so extensive, so many countries venerated his edition, that on account of the wide range of territory over which it prevailed, it was sometimes figuratively called the κοινη ἐκδοσις, or sometimes, by way of change, LUCIANUS [x].

The accounts collected on this subject from antiquity next refer to the emendation of the Old Testament, which Lucian and Hesychius undertook: but, as they also executed that of the New, as we know from the same sources, it may be easily perceived, that both the one and the other, viz. their entire Biblical Codex, had a like fate and a like reception.

Although these two editions, and that of Origen likewise, were publicly approved far and wide in Africa and Asia, and in the south-eastern regions of Europe, and although, as Jerome says, the Christian world split itself into these three varying parties,

[w] Constantinopolis usque ad Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat. Hieron. Præf. in Paralip. L. ii. adv. Ruff. 3. 26.

[x] Illud breviter admoneo, ut sciatis aliam esse Editionem, quam Origenes et Cæsareensis Eusebius, omnesque Græciæ tractatores κοινην, id est, communem appellant, atque vulgatam, et quæ à plerisque nunc Lucianus dicitur. Hieron. Ep. c. 6. ad Sunniam et Fretell. n. 2.

and altercated about them [y], yet, the westerns remained steadfast to the established text, particularly with respect to the New Testament, and if they indeed, or rather Jerome, more indulgently preferred the edition of Origen, they were so much the more decisive opponents of the recensions of Lucian and Hesychius [z], charging them with ill-conducted criticism, which they hoped to establish from the versions, which existed before those recensions. And indeed if these and the Latin versions in particular were received as a standard, the decision in favour of an emended text could not turn out more favourably than it has here.

When therefore Pope Gelasius for the first time drew up an *index librorum prohibitorum*, the editions also of Lucian and Hesychius came into this catalogue in these harsh terms: THE GOSPELS, WHICH LUCIAN AND WHICH HESYCHIUS HAVE FALSIFIED, ARE APOCRYPHAL [a]. Thus, the westerns, almost eternally referred to the κοινη ἐκδοσις, and on no account could a recension find access to them.

But, to return:—the emendation of Origen prevailed in Palæstine, in the middle provinces between the tract occupied by those of Lucian and Hesychius [b].

[y] Totusque orbis hâc inter se trifariâ varietate compugnat. Adv. Ruffin. L. ii. c. 27.

[z] De Novo nunc loquor TESTAMENTO....hoc certe, cum in nostro Sermone discordat, et in diversos rivulorum tramites ducit, uno de fonte quærendum. Prætermitto eos codices, quos à *Luciano* et *Hesychio* nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio, quibus utique nec in toto veteri Instrumento post Septuaginta Interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in Novo profuit emendâsse, cum multarum Gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat, falsa esse, quæ addita sunt. Hieron. in Ep. ad Damasum.

[a] Decret. Pars 1. distinct. xv. §. 27. Evangelia, quæ falsavit Lucianus, apocrypha, evangelia, quæ falsavit Hesychius, apocrypha.

[b] Mediæ inter has provinciæ Palæstinos codices legunt, quos ab

Those who would exclusively confine his merit to the Old Testament, have forgotten that Jerome appealed to Origen's MSS. in the Gospels and Epistles [c].

If we would acquaint ourselves with his recension from his own writings, we should meet but with bad success. He himself has not indeed made much use of it, and it was probably the last work of his mortal undertakings. His commentaries on Matthew were composed in his extreme old age; in these, as we have seen, he complains of the sad state of the Gospels in the different MSS., and speaks with pleasure of his emendation of the Old Testament; but he is conscious of no merit with respect to the New, although indeed, it is a question, to which this immediately relates, where he must have spoken of his recension, if it had already been completed. The old Latin translator of this work here quotes the words of Origen, where he speaks of his emendation of the LXX by means of Obeli and Asterisks, in the following way: BUT I DID NOT BELIEVE, THAT I COULD UNDERTAKE ANY THING SIMILAR IN THE COPIES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WITHOUT RISK [d]. It can be but of little importance, whether what he here says, existed or not in the Greek; since, that which we might probably learn from it, is indeed contained in Origen's other assertions, and as circumstantially contained in them, as it has been declared by the Latin translator.

Origene elaboratos.....Hier. adv. Ruff. L. ii. c. 26. Of the Παλαιστιναιον ευαγγελιον the Scholia of the MSS. on Mark xvi. 8. apud Birch et Griesbach speak. Symb. Crit. P. 1. p. 101.

[c] Hieronym. Commentar. in Matt. xxiv. 36. et in Epist. ad Galat. iii. 1.

[d] Origenes, Tom. xv. in Matt. vol. iii. de la Rue, p. 671. In exemplaribus autem Novi Testamenti hoc ipsum me posse facere sine periculo non putavi.

Hence also arises Origen's looseness in his Biblical text, which could not have been the case, if he had had a fixed and invariable standard by means of a recension: hence it arises, that he so often agrees in considerable variations with the κοινη ἐκδοσις, and has so many readings of Codex D. But, if he sometimes exhibits a text, which is vastly purer than that in D, we should call to mind, that Origen had several MSS. before him, that in his writings he frequently collated several;—a conduct which rendered particular corruptions easily obvious to him and defended his quotations from them. From this conduct that, which an illustrious scholar has observed, must have taken place, viz. that on the whole, he approximates himself more to the MS. L [e]. For, if we remove the greater variations from D, a text appears very like to that of Codex L.

We may remark generally, that Origen in his commentaries upon John, had before him a good and well-preserved Alexandrine text. But, after his departure from Alexandria, this book was of no further service to him. In his subsequent writings, we perceive him following a text, at one time more, at another less formed, and allied to D.

Besides these three men memorable in criticism, the name also of Pierius has remained in honourable memory, on account of his services to the New Testament. His addiction to the study of the Bible, and his acumen procured to him the surname of the younger Origen [f]. Yet, it appears, that he rather had a considerable share in Origen's emendation and its circulation, than that he undertook a recension of his own; for, Jerome so connects the MSS.

[e] Griesbach. Symbol. Critic. T. i. p. cxxiii.—cxxvii.

[f] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. vii. c. 29. Hieronym. de Script. Eccl. v. Pierius.

of Pierius and Origen, that we must believe them to have contained one and the same text [g].

The New Testament also of Pamphilus, the establisher of the library at Cæsarea, was once in no common estimation: he had frequently distributed it among the faithful, that they might become better acquainted with its contents [h]. A copy, written with his own hand, was for a long time preserved in the library, which he had established [i]. But, as it is well known, in the Old Testament, he was only the editor of Origen, who carefully edited the Septuagint from the Hexapla, and thus made the labour of this industrious man generally useful [k]; he also transcribed himself all his other works, which in number and extent constituted a vast mass of labour, and proved himself in every thing a zealous venerator of Origen [l]. Consequently, the copies of Pamphilus, all circumstances considered, are no more than transcripts of Origen's recension, which are deserving of particular regard, from having proceeded from the hand of so illustrious a teacher.

Or—probably, Origen did not live to edite his Emendation, since he entered upon it at the latter part of his life:—did it then first come to light by means of Pierius, and was it still more extended by Pamphilus? Or—did one of them edite it without the critical marks? striking out, without hesitation,

[g] Hieron. Comm. in Matt. xxiv. 36. In quibusdam Codicibus additum est neque filius, cum in Græcis et maxime Adamantii et Pierii Codicibus hoc non habeatur adscriptum.

[h] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. vi. c. 32. Hieron. de Script. Eccl. et L. ii. adv. Ruffin. c. 9. unde et multos codices præparabat, ut, cùm necessitas poposcisset, volentibus largiretur.

[i] Montfaucon. Biblioth. Coislin. p. 262.

[k] Eichhorn's Intr. to the N. Test. P. 1. c. iii. §. 172. Hieron. L. ii. adv. Ruffin. c. 27.

[l] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. vii. c. 32. Hier. Scr. Ec. v. Pamphilus.

that which he by means of an obelus had marked as suspicious, and receiving without hesitation, that which he had recognized by an asterisk to be genuine?

Lastly, in the fourth century Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, composed also a recension: probably, it was a mere version. Whatever it was, Jerome characterizes it, as a compilation undertaken laudably but with little judgment [m]. If we pass this judgment on his labours on the New Testament, we may expect nothing striking: nevertheless, a Scholion of a Parisian MS. on John vii. 53. to viii. 12. seems to speak of copies of Apollinaris [n]. Yet this might be understood of his poetical version of the Gospels.

THE RECENSION OF HESYCHIUS.

SECTION XXXVII.

Some preparations were now made for entering upon the overgrown field of critical documents, for examining them one by one, appreciating their value, and arranging them in their classes; a mighty project, if it be conceived without limitation. It had ceased to be possible to perfectly accomplish this in their full extent: for many of them were only collated in individual passages, many only in part, many not with due care; and some probably would be un-

[m] Lib. ii. adv. Ruffin. c. 33. qui bono quidem studio, sed non secundum scientiam de omnibus translationibus in unum vestimentum pannos assuere conatus est.

[n] τα ὠβελισμενα ἐν τισιν ἀντιγραφοις οὐ κεινται, οὐδε Ἀπολλιναριῳ· ἐν τοις ἀρχαιοις ὁλα κειναι. Richard Simon, Histoire Crit. du Texte du Nouv. Test. c. xiii. p. 146.

worthy of this consideration and labour. We can therefore only adduce those documents, which are particularly well executed, and on account of their age and correctness require a peculiar attention, and declare their character in the most decisive manner: the others may then be added to them according to time and merit.

Let us now first seek for the Egyptian recension, since for many reasons it is the easiest to be found. That recension, which had the authority of the Church in Alexandria and Egypt, must be expressed in the works of the Fathers of that country. But these follow the text, which has reached us in MSS. B. C. and L.——B. is the famous Vatican N. 1209. C. is MS. N. 9. in the National library, called also that of Ephræm Syrus; L. is marked N. 62. in the same library, all of which in their proper place, we shall more diffusely describe.

The quotations of Athanasius, in those works, which by common consent are attributed to him, on the whole, represent this text; as well as the writings of the monks Marcus and Macarius, of Cosmas Indicopleustes, and Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria. I have satisfied myself on the point by actual collation: but, here I cannot lay down proofs obtained by long research, yet I must in regard to the last call to mind, that his Biblical MS. is here and there disfigured by extraneous additions and interpolations.

But without referring to the proofs to which I have appealed, this must be evident from its origin, the infallible signs of which the text of these three MSS. bears with it; then, it will be admitted (for which assertion I have already justified myself) that D expresses the κοινη ἐκδοσις, principally of Alexandria and Egypt, so that we need be no longer in difficulty concerning the native country of these three MSS.

or rather of their text. They are evidently only corrected copies of this κοινη ἐκδοσις.

The Coptic version also was composed from MSS. of the country, yet it is known also to be a true companion of this illustrious document, which has here been adduced, as an Egyptian recension.

They therefore actually contain the recension of Hesychius, and might now develope to us in collation with the κοινη ἐκδοσις, from which they proceed, the critical conduct, which he had prescribed to himself. We see at first, that he removes the greater interpolations, which were inserted from the Harmonies, the Apocrypha, or the parallel passages of the Old and New Testament, and that he has brought back the peculiar words of the Evangelists, which in many instances were thrown together, to their right authors. Besides, he has rejected many glosses and Scholia; what had been introduced from the Lectionaries, he has often felicitously expunged, and again restored lost sentences. These and many like errors, which we have observed in the κοινη ἐκδοσις, as a diligent critic he has endeavoured to remedy.

Yet could he not obliterate a host of minor and very evident traces of the copies, from which he worked; much even remains, notwithstanding his emendations, which appears not to have deserved this forbearance, partly from Lectionaries, partly from parallel passages; probably, he might have been able to bring back and restore many omissions, which are in his recension, and still oftener to destroy a gloss on them, which now we cannot easily detect. But, I have only said, this appears to be the case; for more confidently to assert this accusation, we must even in detail clear the whole history of the text.

However we meet in it with readings, which we in vain seek in Codex D; but, since he has adopted

them, they must certainly be substantiated by other MSS. Of this sort is in Matt. xxvii. 49. after σωσον αὐτον, the addition in B. C. L. and the Coptic version, ἀλλος λαβων λογχην, ἠνυξεν αὐτου την πλευραν, και ἐξηλθεν ὑδωρ και αἱμα, or the transposition in Mark x. 34. και ἐμπτυσουσιν αὐτῳ, και μαστιγωσουσιν αὐτον, or in Luke vi. 48. for τεθεμελ πετραν, the passage δια το καλως οἰκοδομεισθαι αὐτην ; also, in Mark x. 49. where instead of εἰπεν αὐτον φωνηθηναι in B. C. L. and the Coptic, this variation occurs, εἰπεν, φωνησατε αὐτον, which two last readings Thomas of Charkel found in his old Alexandrine MS.

Moreover, the observation is particularly remarkable, which acquaints us with a critical principle of this individual, which he took from profane literature, and applied unfortunately to the New Testament. For, it appears, that he had prescribed to himself a law to prefer the more elegant and pure, in reference to Greek Syntax, to the harsher and Hellenistic reading, wherever he found it. For example, in Mark xii. 21., for ἀπεθανεν, και οὐδε αὐτος ἀφηκε σπερμα, he chose ἀπεθανεν μη καταλιπων σπερμα, the phraseology of which is more elegant. In Mark x. 51. in B.C.L., τι σοι θελεις ποιησω, or John xvi. 22., νυν μεν λυπην ἐχετε. In Luke v. 36., the passage has a better turning, ὁτι οὐδεις ἐπιβλημα ἀπο ἱματιου καινου σχισας ἐπιβαλλει and Luke xxi. 36., is expressed less Judaically, ἱνα κατισχυσητε ἐκφυγειν, or xxiii. 42., ὁταν ἐλθῃς εἰς την βασιλειαν σου, or xxiii. 40, ἐπιτιμων αὐτῳ ἐφη, &c.

In the Acts of the Apostles, one of these MSS. departs from Codex L, which only contains the Gospels, but another (A or ALEX. *Mus. Britann.*) compensates for its departure, whence we have ABC, which in this book represent Hesychius's edition. To these may be added a MS., which Euthalius, the

Alexandrian deacon, examined and stichometrically divided; or, to speak more correctly, a transcript of one such exemplar. This MS. is marked in Wetstein and Griesbach, Acts n. 40., and has been extracted by Zacagni in the monumentis ineditis. Here also Codex I, or *Mosc. S. Synod. n.* CCCLXXX asserts a pre-eminent rank, which contains the whole New Testament, after another recension, and is only written after the Alexandrine copy in the Acts of the Apostles, also *Cod. Urbino Vatican, n.* 367. apud Birch. It appears to me, that here may likewise be classed *Cod. Collegii novi Oxon.*—apud Mill. *nov.* 1.—apud Wetstein and Griesbach, 36.

If we would bring in array before us, the various descriptions of errors which the κοινη ἐκδοσις has admitted in this book more particularly, and then combine together with it the text of these MSS., we might thus probably compute, what the emendator avoided in this book, and what he principally did. By such a comparison, we shall be in a certain degree able to perceive, how from the confused text of the MSS. D.E. and those like to them, the better formed text of the MSS. A.B.C. and their fellows, which is purified from foreign excrescences, was developed.

In the Catholic Epistles, the MSS. A.B.C. continue, as well as the Euthalian MS. 40., and Birch's Urbino-Vat. 367, to express the emendation of Hesychius. But here Codex I forsakes us, and passes over to its own particular recension.

In the Epistles of the Apostle Paul, A.B.C. are likewise the chief documents of Hesychius's text. The Euthalian Codex agrees with them, which in Paul's Epistles is marked in Wetstein and Griesbach n. 46. The Urbino-Vat. 367., which was in the preceding parts its faithful companion, is here unfaith-

ful, and fluctuates between two texts: hence another is added, viz. Colbert. 2844, now n. 14., which has been examined de novo by Griesbach, and after him again collated by Begtrupp, whose extracts Birch has published after his collection of various readings in the Apocalypse. In Wetstein and Griesbach it bears the mark 17.

In this part also we may be easily convinced, that the revised text was composed from MSS. which had an uncommon resemblance to MSS. D.E. and F.G. This will hereafter be evident, when we extract some specimens from the particular recensions, and place one against the other.

We have the Apocalypse according to Hesychius's edition in the MSS. A.C. The Codex B or Vatican. 1209. does not extend so far, and the MS. which in the Apocalypse now bears the mark B, does not belong to it. But another Vatican MS., marked number 579., which Birch has collated, although, as is the case with more modern MSS., it contains many heterogeneous readings, decisively declares itself on the side of A.C.

To these also *Vindob. Cæs. in Supplement. Kollarii* n. xxvi. is strikingly similar, even though it bears some traces of later times: it has been collated by Professor Alter. We might add to these two other MSS. in this library, if the numerous alterations to which they were exposed, made the analogy less doubtful.

Lastly, the Apocalypse, which appears at the end of the often quoted Euthalian Codex, and is called in Millius *Petav.* 3., in Wetstein and Griesbach Apoc. 12. is far from being sufficiently known. But according to the specimens, which Birch has given in the Prolegomena to the collection of various readings in

the Apocalypse, and to judge from the other citations of Millius, it expresses, although not without more recent alterations, the text of the copies A.C.

THE RECENSION OF LUCIAN.

SECTION XXXVIII.

ANOTHER recension is contained in MSS. E.F.G. H.S.V. and *b h*, viz. in regard to the Gospels, of which we must speak in the first place. All are written in capital letters, in the uncial character. The first is a very beautiful MS. in the library at Basle, *num. B.* vi. 21; the other F once belonged to Johann Borcel, the Dutch embassador at the English court. The MSS. G and H of the Gospels were brought from the East by Erasmus Seidel, and afterwards came into the possession of John Christopher Wolf, of Hamburg; the first of them is now in the British Museum, *Harleian MSS.* 5084. The MS. S is n. 354. in the Vatican library, collated by Birch, and V is in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow, a beautiful MS., with which Matthæi first made us correctly acquainted. By him also the MSS. *b* and *h* were collated, two valuable Evangeliaria, the first of which is in the same library, n. xliii., the other in the library of the press of the Holy Synod, n. xii.

Were we here inclined to mention also the more modern MSS., which are written in cursive characters, this list would be considerably enlarged; a great part of those, which Matthæi collated at Moscow, the majority in Birch and Alter, also the greater number in Mill and Wetstein, are of this family. Yet, a subdivision may here take place, for this recension, after it had suffered somewhat in the course of time,

was probably examined and revised by some one. But this incidental remark is only an hypothesis, which I cannot here illustrate without descending into tedious particulars.

The basis of this recension is the κοινη ἐκδοσις, as it was read in Syria. If this assertion be correct, as we shall soon find it to be, we are no longer in the dark respecting its country and author. It must have originated in Syria, and then it would be the recension of Lucian, Presbyter of Antioch, which was circulated from thence as far as Constantinople and in Thrace: we recognize it in the Constantinopolitan teachers, *e. g.* in Theophylact, although his text be no longer in a positive state of purity.

We have cited above some remarkable readings, which characterize the most ancient text in Syria, and the Egyptian books, before and after Hesychius, and did not even occur in the versions of this country. These, the number of which we might here considerably augment, we again meet in the great family of MSS., which we have adduced for the emendation of Lucian, since in them are Matt. vi. 13., ὁτι σου ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεια και ἡ δυναμις, και ἡ δοξα, εἰς τους αἰωνας. F.G.S.V. *b h* (here the MSS. E.H. are defective) Matt. xx. 22., μελλω πινειν· ... και το βαπτισμα, ὁ ἐγω βαπτιζομαι, βαπτισθηναι, and vers. 23., και το βαπτ. ὁ ἐγω βαπτ. βαπτισθησεσθε, E. H. S. V. Here indeed F.G. are defective, and *b h* are silent, but we might easily replace their testimony by some dozen others. Mark vi. 11., εἰς μαρτ. αὐτοις—ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν, ἀνεκτοτερον ἐσται Σοδομοις, ἡ Γομορροις ἐν ἡμερᾳ κρισεως, ἡ τῃ πολει ἐκεινῃ. E. F. G. H. S. V. *b h*; Matt. xiii. 14., της ἐρημωσεως,—το ῥηθεν ὑπο Δανιηλ του προφητου, E. F. G. H. S. V. *b h*; Luke iv. 18., ἀπεσταλκε με —ἰασασθαι τους συντετριμμενους την καρδιαν; Luke x. 22., και στραφεις προς τους μαθητας εἰπε; John i. 27. ὁ ὀπισω

μου ἐρχομενος—ὁς ἐμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν; John v. 16., οἱ Ἰουδαιοι—και ἐζητουν αὐτον ἀποκτειναι; John vi. 22., εἰ μη ἐν—ἐκεινο εἰς ὁ ἀνεβησαν οἱ μαθηται αὐτου; also John vi. 69., συ εἰ ὁ υἱος του Θεου ζωντος. If here and there in these passages, one of the testimonies be omitted, as F, which has not been collated in John, and *b h*, which are silent in John v. 16. and vi. 22., as is also the case with *h* in John i. 27., we might without hesitation pass them over; since a host of other MSS. of this family would also certify us, that these characteristic readings of the κοινη ἐκδοσις in Syria belonged also to this recension, and were peculiar to it.

The deduction of this text from the copies of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, as it was read in Syria, cannot better be rendered obvious to us, than by citing the next best passage from the Gospels, and comparing it with the Peschito. On this occasion it cannot be unacceptable to see the two recensions in parallel columns, viz. that of Lucian and that of Hesychius, and then to consider the relation of the last to Codex D, and without labour to observe how many of its peculiarities remained in the recension, which is derived from it and MSS. like it. For this purpose we select the fourth chapter of Mark.

	HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
1.	συναγεται	BCL.	συνηχθη.
	ὀχλος πλειστος	BCL.	ὀχλος πολυς.
	εἰς το πλοιον ἐμβαντα	BCLD.	ἐμβαντα εἰς το πλοιον. Syr.
	γης ἠσαν	BCL.	γης ην. Syr.
6.	και ὁτε ἀνετειλεν ὁ ἡλιος	BCLD. Syr.	ἡλιου δε ανατειλαντος.
8.	ἀλλα ἐπεσ...	BCL.	ἀλλο ἐπεσ... Syr.
	αὐξανομενον	BCLD.	αὐξανοντα
10.	και ὁτε	BCLD.	ὁτε δε. Syr.
	ἠρωτων	BCL.	ἠρωτησαν.
	τας παραβολας	BCL.	την παραβολην. Syr.

HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
11. ὑμιν το μυστηριον δεδοται	BL. Copt.	νμιν δεδοται γνωναι το μυστηριον. Syr.
12. ἀφεθη αὐτοις	BCL.	ἀφεθη αὐτοις τα ἁμαρτηματα. Syr.
15. εὐθυς	BCL.	εὐθεως.
ἐν αὐτοις (εἰς αὐτους B)	CL.	ἐν ταις καρδιαις αὐτων. Syr.
16. εὐθυς	BCL.	εὐθεως.
18. και ἀλλοι εἰσιν	BCL.	και οὐτοι εἰσιν. Syr.
ἀκουσαντες	BCLD.	ἀκουοντες.
19. του αἰωνος	BCLD.	του αἰωνος τουτου. Syr.
20. και ἐκεινοι εἰσιν	BCL.	και οὐτοι εἰσιν. Syr.
22. ἐαν μη	BCL.	ὁ ἐαν μη.
24. ὑμιν και προστεθησεται ὑμιν	BCL.	ὑμιν και προστεθησεται ὑμιν τοις ἀκουουσι. Syr.
28. αὐτοματη ἡ γη	BCL.	αὐτοματη γαρ ἡ γη. Syr.
30. πως ὁμοιωσ. . . .	BCL.	τινι ὁμοιωσ
31. μικροτερον	BLD.	μικροτερος
32. μειζων (μειζον) παντων των λαχανων	BCLD Syr.	παντων των λαχανων μειζων.
34. τοις ἰδιοις μαθηταις	BCL.	τοις μαθηταις αὐτου. Syr.
36. και ἀλλα	BL. Copt. Syr.	και ἀλλα δε.
πλοια	BCD.	πλοιαρια.
37. ᾗδη γεμιζεσθαι το πλοιον	BCLD.	αὐτο ἠδη γεμιζεσθαι. Syr.
38. ἐν τῃ πρυμ . . .	BCLD. Syr.	ἐπι τῃ πρυμ . . .
40. τι δειλοι ἐστε οὐτω	BL Copt. D.	τι δειλοι ἐστε, οὐτω, πως οὐκ. Syr.

By placing them thus one against the other, without multiplying examples, we thoroughly ascertain both recensions: the various readings, which are discernible in them, are merely errors and modifications of individual MSS., which often obscure our view of both recensions, when we pay too much attention to them. A number of uniform MSS. must therefore have pervaded the whole, where we would however remember, that in an instance, like that which will hereafter

occur to us, we have not before us the irregular trifling of erroneous and accidental readings.

What we wished further to see from the preceding specimens, viz. the deduction of this recension from the κοινη ἐκδοσις, as it was circulated in Syria, we might have seen from the collation of the Peschito, which was composed before Lucian, and consequently from an ancient copy. Now, if we compare his recension with this ancient copy, we shall easily infer, how he proceeded; we shall observe, that he has expunged and removed what was transferred from one Evangelist into the other, Matt. xxii. 37., xxviii. 18., Mark viii. 29., Luke ix. 39., xxiv. 36. what was inserted, on account of the Church-lessons, Matt. xx. 17., Luke xix. 26., also exegetical additions, amplifications, and circumlocutions, Matt. xxi. 34., vi. 32., xiv. 6., Mark vi. 31., ix. 3., Luke ix. 29., John vii. 39., transpositions, Matt. vii. 30., Mark vi. 51., and other extraneous matter of the same description.

He has, however, admitted readings, which did not occur in the copy, from whence the Peschito was made: *e. g.* Matt. xxiv. 13., την ὡραν....ἐν ᾗ ὁ υἱος του ἀνθρωπου ἐρχεται: John viii. 59., ἐκ του ἱερου—και προηγεν ουτως; John xi. 41., τον λιθον—οὐ ἠν ὁ τεθνηκως κειμενος, which also were approved by a great part of his MSS.

This recension, in reference to the Acts of the Apostles, exists in the Moscow MSS. *f.* or *S. Synod.* cccxxxiii., in *a* (S. Synod xlv,), *b* (S. Synod. iv. Praxapost.), *d* (S. Synod. cccxxxiv.), also in *c* (S. Synod cccclxiv), and *m* (S. Synod. cccxxviii.), all of which have been collated by Matthæi: moreover, it exists in Codex *k*, which belongs to this scholar. Among them *f* appears to be the preferable copy, but *c* and *m* have suffered the most from unseasonab[illegible]

corrections. To these may be added a very good MS. (*Alexandrino-Vatic.* 29. apud Birch,) and the MSS. of the Royal Library, *Lambec.* xxxvii. or *Nessel* ccxxi., also *Lambec.* xxxv. or *Nessel* cccxiii. All of these have a perfectly determinate character, nor do they stand singly; but their family is numerous, and the individuals of it are scattered through other collections; their text, however, is not equally pure, or they frequently have not been extracted with the same requisite care.

We must still notice, in regard to the Acts of the Apostles of this recension, the singular fact, that it does not so firmly and invariably adhere, as the other Biblical books, to the readings of the Syriac text. Nor is it so far remote, that no traces of its relationship remain. Among the characteristic readings peculiar to this recension, none of great extent are discerned: the greatest is in Acts xxvi. 30., where the Egyptian simply says, ανεστη ὁ βασιλευς A. B. 40. 367. I. Copt. also express themselves in the same way: και ταυτα ειποντος αὐτου ανεστη ὁ βασιλευς. *f. ai. b. d. k. c. m. Alex.-Vat.* 29. *Lambec.* xxxv. and *Lambec.* xxxvii. Yet the most remarkable is in Acts xx. 28., for where some MSS. read Κυριου, others Χριστου, or even Θεου, this unites the two readings, την εκκλησιαν Κυριου και Θεου. *f. ai. b. d. k. c. m. Alex.-Vat.* 29. *Lambec.* xxxv. and *Lambec.* xxxvii.

We will also here (as we have done in the Gospels), place some passages of both recensions one against the other, for which purpose we select Acts xxiv. and xxv. Of the MSS. of the Egyptian recension, which we have named above, C is sometimes defective, and so is D in both chapters of its κοινη εκδοσις: but as to the Acts of the Apostles, we have still another celebrated copy of it, viz. the Laudian MS. E, which we add to the collation.

ACTS XXIV.

HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
1. μετα πρεσβυτερων τινων.	AB. 40. 367. I.E.	μετα των πρεσβυτερων. Syr.
5. στασεις.	AB. 40. 367. I.E.	στασιν. Syr.
9. συνεπεθεντο.	AB. 40. 367. I.E.	συνεθεντο.
10. κριτην δικαιον.	B. 40. 367. I.	κριτην. Syr.
εὐθυμως.	AB. 40. 367. I.	εὐθυμοτερον.
11. ἡμεραι δωδεκα	AB. 40. I.	ἡμεραι δεκαδυο.
εἰς Ἱερουσαλημ.	A. 40. 367. I.Syr.	ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ.
12. ἐπιστασιν.	AB. 40. 367. E.	ἐπισυστασιν.
13. δυνανται σοι.	AB. 40. 367. I.E.	δυναται. Syr.
15. μελλ. ἐσεσθαι.	ABC. 40.	μελλ. ἐσεσθαι νεκρων. Syr.
16. ἐν τουτῳ και.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E.	ἐν τουτῳ δε. Syr.
18. ἐν αἰς εὑρ.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E.	ἐν οἰς εὑρ.
22. ἀνεβαλετο δε αὐτους ὁ Φηλιξ.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E.	ἀκουσας δε ταυτα, ἀνεβαλετο αὐτους ὁ Φηλιξ. Syr.
23. τηρεισθαι αὐτον	ABC. 40. 367. I.E.	τηρεισθαι τον Παυλον. Syr.
ὑπηρετειν.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E. Syr.	ὑπηρετειν ἡ προσερχεσθαι.
25. ἐμφοβος.	ABC. 40. 367. I.	ἐσεσθαι, ἐμφοβος.
26. Παυλου· διο	AC. 40. 367. I.E. Syr.	Παυλου, ὁπως λυσῃ αὐτον, διο.
27. χαριτα.	ABC. 40.	χαριτας,
χαριν.	367. I.	

ACTS XXV.

5. ἀνδρι ἀτοπον	AB. 40. 367. I.E.	ἀνδρι τουτῳ. Syr.
6. οὐ πλειους ὀκτω ἡ δεκα.	ABC. 40. 367. I. Syr.	πλειους ἡ δεκα.
7. περιεστησαν αὐτον.	AB. 367. αὐτῳ, 40. I.	περιεστησαν.
καταφεροντες.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E.	φεροντες.
κατα του Παυλον. omit.	AC. 40. 367. Syr.	κατα του Παυλου.
8. του Παυλου ἀπολογουμενου.	ABC. 40. 367. Syr.	ἀπολογουμενου αὐτου.
9. κριθηναι.	AB. 40. 367. I.	κρινεσθαι.

HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
11. εἰ μεν οὐν.	ABC. I.E. Syr.	εἰ μεν γαρ.
15. καταδικην.	ABC. 40. 367. I.	δικην.
16. ἀνθρωπον πριν.	ABC. 40. E.	ἀνθρωπον εἰς ἀπωλειαν πριν. Syr.
18. ἐφερον, ὠν.	AC. 40. 367. I.E.	ἐπεφερον, ὠν.
ὑπεν. ἐγω πονηραν, or πονηρων.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E. Syr.	ὑπεν. ἐγω.
20. περι τουτων.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E. Syr.	περι τουτου.
21. ἀναπεμψω.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E.	πεμψω.
23. κατεξοχ. τ. πολ.	ABC. 40. I. Syr.	κατεξοχ. οὐσι τι πολ.
25. κατελαβομην.	AB. 40. 367. I.	καταλαβομενος.
αὐτου δε.	ABC. 40. 367. I.E.	και αὐτου δε. Syr.
πεμπειν.	ABC. 50. 367.	πεμπειν αὐτον.
26. τι γραψω.	AB. I. Syr.	τι γραψαι.

In Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, the principal book in favour of Lucian's text is a beautiful MS., executed with uncial characters (it is furnished with Scholia in the current character), which in the library of the Holy Synod bears the number xcviii., and is named G by Matthæi. As we already have a Codex G in Paul's Epistles, we will designate it by the smaller letter *g*.—*f* takes the rank after it, then *k l m c d*, and the two πραξαποστολοι *a* 3 and *b*. Excepting *g*, all have already occurred in the Acts of the Apostles, where however, Codex I or S. Synod. ccclxxx. agreed with the text of Hesychius.

Besides these, Matthæi found in Paul particularly, n. xcix. in the library of the Holy Synod: he quotes its readings under the letter *n*.

Still further, *Alexandrino-Vat.* 29., also *Pio-Vat.* 50. apud Birch, and *Lambec.* xxviii., *Lambec.* xxxvii., *Lambec.* xxxv., *Lambec.* 1., or *Nessel.* xxxiii. contain Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, according to this recension, all from the library at Vienna, where they have been collated by Alter. But the text of

Paul throughout is preserved in these MSS. purer and in a better state, than that of the Catholic Epistles.

The relationship to the Syriac version, which appeared less striking in the Acts of the Apostles, and was scarcely at all discernible in the 25th chapter, is here again strongly expressed; yet must we, as it is easily conceivable, except those of the Catholic Epistles, which were no original parts of the Peschito, and were only in later times added to it.

The Epistles of Paul are not wanting in greater and more distinguished readings, of which we here cite each sort of example. In Rom. iii. 1. Lucian's MSS. add after ἐν Χριστῳ Ἰησου,—μη κατα σαρκα περιπατουσιν, ἀλλα κατα πνευμα, *g. f. k. l. m. n. c. a* 3. *b. Alex-Vat.* 29. *Pio-Vat.* 50. *Lambec.* 1. xxviii. xxxv. xxxvii. which is read in very few Alexandrine MSS.:—of this addition the Peschito has only the first half, as far as ἀλλα. So the passage in Rom. xi. 6. is seldom found in the copies of Hesychius, εἰ δε ἐξ ἐργων, οὐκ ἐτι ἐστι χαρις, ἐπει το ἐργον οὐκ ἐτι ἐστιν ἐργον, which all the before-quoted MSS., and even Codex *d* (which there has not agreed with it) and the old Syriac version express. In the first Epistle to the Corinthians vi. 20. the passage, και ἐν τῳ Πνευματι ὑμων, ἁτινα ἐστε Θεου is after the words σωματι ὑμων, which only the Lucian MSS. *i. e.* those before quoted, and the Syriac version recognize. The same likewise takes place in the Catholic Epistles, 1 John v. 13. ταυτα ἐγραψα ὑμιν—τοις πιστευουσιν εἰς το ὀνομα του υἱου του Θεου, in which, contrary to the custom of the Alexandrine, all coincide, the Syriac version alone not concurring with them.

That we may once more observe both recensions in parallel columns, and their derivation on the one side from the MSS. DEFG, in the Epistles of

Paul, and on the other, from the text, which is expressed in the Peschito, let us exhibit the ninth and tenth chapters of the first Epistle to the Corinthians and from the Catholic, the Epistle of Jude.

CHAPTER IX.

HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
1. οὐκ εἰμι ἐλευθερος; οὐκ εἰμι ἀποστολος;	AB. Copt. 17. 46. Syr.	οὐκ εἰμι ἀποστολος; οὐκ εἰμι ἐλευθερος;
7. τον καρπον αὐτον.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	ἐκ του αὐτου καρπου. Syr.
8. ἡ και ὁ νομος ταυτα οὐ λεγει;	ABC. 46. DE.	ἡ οὐχι και ὁ νομος ταυτα λεγει; Syr.
10. ὀφειλει ἐπ' ἐλπιδι.	ABC. 17. 46.	ἐπ' ἐλπιδι ὀφειλει. Syr.
ἐπ' ἐλπιδι του μετεχειν °.	ABC. 17. 46. Syr.	της ἐλπιδος αὐτου μετεχειν ἐπ' ἐλπιδι.
12. ὑμων (της) ἐξουσιας.	ABC. 46. DFG.	της ἐξουσιας ὑμων.
13. παρεδρευοντες.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	προσεδρευοντες.
16. και γαρ μοι.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	οὐαι δε μοι. Syr.
18. εὐαγγελιον, εἰς το	ABC. 17. 46. D.	εὐαγγελιον του Χριστου, εἰς το.
20. ὡς ὑπο νομον, μη ὢν αὐτος ὑπο νομον.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	ὡς ὑπο νομον. Syr.
21. Θεου, ἀλλ' ἐννομος Χριστου.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	Θεῳ, ἀλλ' ἐννομος Χριστῳ.
23. παντα δε ποιω.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	τουτο δε ποιω. Syr.

CHAPTER X.

1. οὐ θελω γαρ.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	οὐ θελω δε. Syr.
2. ἐβαπτισθησαν.	AC. 17. 46. DEFG.	ἐβαπτισαντο.
9. τινες αὐτων	ABC. 46. DFG.	και τινες αὐτων. Syr.
10. τινες.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG. Syr.	και τινες.
11. τυπικως συνεβ.	ABC. 17. 46. F.	τυποι συνεβ. Syr.
19. ..εἰδωλοθυτον.. ὡι· ..εἰδωλον	ABC. 17. 46.	..εἰδωλον.... ..εἰδωλοθυτον. Syr.

[redacted] 46. reads in the second clause, ἐπ' ἐλπιδος αὐτου.

HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
20. θνουσι *bis.*	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	θνες *bis.*
23. παντα ἐξεστιν *bis.*	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	παντα μοι ἐξεστιν. *bis.* Syr.
24. το του ἑτερου.	ABC. 17. DEFG.	το του ἑτερου ἑκαστος. Syr.
28. την συνειδησιν *Copt.*	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG. Syr.	την συνειδησιν, του γαρ Κυριου ἡ γη, και το πληρωμα αὐτης.

The contrast of the two recensions would be still more distinguished by other readings, if we could appeal to more accurately collated MSS. of the Egyptian text, to determine (where the one or the other has an omission) from the rest, what the recension read peculiar to itself. Probably, the following readings are not errata of individual MSS., but an Egyptian text, which is not sufficiently established: 1 Cor. ix. 3. αὐτη ἐστι—ἐστιν αὐτη. AB. 46. v. 12. ἐγκοπην τινα—τινα ἐγκοπην. AB. v. 15. ἱνα τις κενωσῃ—οὐδεις κενωσει. AB. 17., and οὐ κεχρημαι οὐδενι, AB. 17. X. 16. κοινωνια ἐστι (του) αἱματος του Χριστου. AB., v. 32. και Ἰουδαιοις γινεσθε. AB.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

HESYCHIUS.			LUCIAN.
1. ἡγαπημενοις	AB.	367.	ἡγιασμενοις.
3. κοινης ἡμων σωτηρ.	*Copt.* A.	367.	κοινης σωτηρ.
4. Δεσποτην και Κυριον	ABC.	367.	Δεσποτην Θεον και Κυριον.
5. ἁπαξ παντα	ABC.	367.	ἁπαξ τουτο.
15. ἀσεβεις.	ABC.	367.	ἀσεβεις αὐτων.
18. ἐπ' ἐσχατου (του) χρονου.	ABC.	367.	ἐν ἐσχατῳ χρονῳ.
20. ἐποικοδομουντες ἑαυτους τῃ ἁγιωτατῃ ἡμων πιστει.	AB.	367.	τῃ ἁγιωτατῃ ὑμων πιστει ἐποικοδομουντες ἑαυτους.
22. και οὑς μεν ἐλεγχετε διακρινομενους.	ABC. 40.	367.	και οὑς μεν ἐλεειτε διακρινομενοι.

HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
23. οὺς δε σωζετε ἐκ πυρος ἁρπαζοντες (οὺς δε ἐλεατε) (ἐλεειτε) ἐν φοβῳ.	ABC. 40. 367.	οὺς δε ἐν φοβῳ σωζετε ἐκ (του) πυρος ἁρπαζοντες.
25. μονῳ Θεῳ.	ABC. 40. 367.	μονῳ σοφῳ Θεῳ.
σωτηρι ἡμων δια Ἰησου Χριστου του Κυριου ἡμων.	ABC. 40. 367.	σωτηρι ἡμων.
δοξα, μεγαλωσυνη.	AB. 367.	δοξα και μεγαλωσυνη.
ἐξουσια προ παντος (του) αἰωνος.	ABC. 40. 367.	ἐξουσια και νυν, και εἰς παντας τους αἰωνας.

Codex 40. is at the beginning unfaithful in the smaller readings, as I am perfectly convinced from the collation of Bœcler's edition, from which Zacagni made his extracts: if however we only abide by that, in which all the cited Egyptian MSS. are agreed, there are still sufficient variations in this small portion, for us to observe two recensions in them in the course of the contrast.

The Apocalypse, according to this recension, is in the Moscow MSS. *r. k. p. l.* and *o.*, of the first we neither know, the place, nor the number[P]; —of *k.* and *l.* enough has been already shewn; *p.* is S. Synod. ccvi., *o.* is S. Synod. lxvii., with the Scholia of Andreas. They are not all equally good, for throughout in this book it is difficult to find, among the modern, pure and uncorrupted MSS.:—and such ancient and venerable documents, as A and C, do not even exist in the Apocalyptical text of Hesychius. Among these, Codex *o* has suffered the most.

But MS. *Harleian* 5613. is a particularly good MS., which Griesbach collated, and marked in his edition, numb. 29. Also *Lambec.* I. or *Nessel.* xxiii.

[P] It is but briefly noticed, after the Epistle to the Romans in Matthæi's Edition, § 376.

collated by Alter, and *Alexandrino-Vat.* 68. *Vatican.* 1160., *Pio-Vat.* 50. are among the number of good copies.

Bishop Andreas of Cappadocia followed this text in his Commentaries, yet not so exclusively as to prevent him from also citing other MSS.

MS. B. or *Basilianorum in Urbe, n.* cv., written in uncial characters, and collated by Wetstein, alternates in its readings between this and Hesychius's recension. Yet, it has much, which is peculiar to it, which occurs neither in the one nor in the other, and seems to me to quote a recension of its own, with which Wetstein's N. 9. or *Huntingtonianus* 1., and Wets. N. 14. or the Leicester MS. might be associated. However, for the present I must content myself, without pursuing this subject farther, to produce specimens of each of the two recensions, of the existence of which we have been convinced by a chain of proofs.

APOCALYPSE I.

HESYCHIUS.		LUCIAN.
4. ἀπο ὁ ὠν.	AC. 579.	ἀπο Θεου, ὁ ὠν.
5. λυσαντι.	AC. Koll. 26.	λουσαντι.
ἐκ των ἁμαρτ.	AC. Koll. 26. 579.	ἀπο των ἁμαρτ.
9. συγκοινωνος.	AC. Koll. 26. 579.	κοινωνος.
και την μαρτυρ.	AC. 579.	και δια την μαρτ.
Ἰησου.	AC. Koll. 26. 579.	Ἰησου Χριστου.
13. των λυχνιων.	AC. 579.	των ἑπτα λυχνιων.
15. πεπυρωμενης.	AC.	πεπυρωμενοι.
18. των αἰωνων.	AC. Koll. 26. 579.	των αἰωνων. Ἀμην.

arise? was it not so formerly, since the west was furnished with Greek MSS. from Egypt? Things however are very much altered; at the revival of science in the west we obtained Greek literature, MSS. and language by means of comers from Constantinople: whoever was desirous of acquiring this knowledge, or of perfecting it when acquired, travelled there, or in the islands and provinces of Europæan Greece, and there collated the literary treasures, from which he wished to derive information to himself, on his return home. Thus, were our libraries chiefly enriched from those countries, in which Lucian's edition prevailed, and probably the fourth part of our MSS. are from Mount Athos, and from the hand of the industrious monks, who were there employed in transcribing them.

The knowledge of the Greek language in Egypt was as far as the fourth century downwards visibly effaced, and was confined only to the countries along the coast of the Mediterranean sea, and finally, only to Alexandria itself. But with the conquest of the Arabs it departed from the country, at least for a time, until a return was again conceded to it. The influence which the changes, which took place in Egypt, had on the Greek MSS. of the Bible, is hereafter discussed, in the 41st § with proofs.

THE RECENSION OF ORIGEN.

SECTION XXXIX.

ORIGEN, as we have said, devoted the last days of a laborious and indefatigable life to the emendation of the New Testament. On this account, it has not

of Winchelsea; 114 is the Harleian MS. 5540. in the British Museum, and 116 is the Harleian, 5567. in the same, both collated by Griesbach. Codex 10 is a splendid MS. of the Gospels, in the Library of Nicephorus, Archbishop of Cherson.

We would now notice this recension, in some examples.

Alexandrine Recension.		Matthæi.	Constantinopolitan Recension.
LUKE IX.			
1. δωδεκα μαθητας αὐτου	δωδεκα	AKM. 42. 106. 114. 116. 10.	δωδεκα.
5. μη δεχωνται	μη δεχωνται	AK. 116. Mti. 10.	μη δεξωνται.
10. εἰς πολιν καλουμενην Βηθσ. . . .	εἰς ἐρημιον οπου πολεως καλουμενης Βηθσ..	A. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	εἰς τοπ τν ἐρημον πολεως καλ. Βηθσ. . ..
21. μηδ. λεγειν τουτο	μηδ. λεγειν τουτο	AM. 42. 116. Mti. 10.	μηδ. εἰπειν τουτο.
22. τ. τ. ἡ ἐγερθηναι, as it appears	τ. τ. ἡ ἀναστηναι	AK. 42. 116. Mti. 10.	τ. τ. ἡ ἐγερθηναι.
23. ὀπ. μου ἐρχεσθαι	ὀπ. μου ἐλθειν.	AK. 42. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	ὀπ. μου ἐλθειν.
ἀρνησασθω, probably	ἀρνησασθω	AK. 42. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	ἀπαρνησασθω.
αὐτου και ἀκολουθ. μοι, conjecturally	αὐτου καθ' ἡμεραν, και ἀκολουθ. μοι.	AK. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	αὐτου και ἀκολουθ. μοι.
27. ἀληθως εἰσι ἑστηκοτων	ἀληθως ὁτι εἰσι ἑστωτων	KM. 116. Mti. 10.	ἀληθως εἰσιν.
		AKM. 42. 106. 116. Mti. 10.	ἑστωτων.
38. ἐπιβλεψον ὁτι τον	ἐπιβλεψαι ὁτι τον	AKM. 42. 106. 116. Mti. 10.	ἐπιβλεψαι ἐπι τον.
41. και ἀνεξομαι	ἑως ποτε ἀνεξομαι	K. 42. 116. Mti. 10.	και ἀνεξομαι.
45. ἐρωτησαι αὐτον, probably	ἐπερωτησαι αὐτον	KM. 116. Mti. 10.	ἐρωτησαι αὐτον.
50. καθ' ὑμων ὑπερ ὑμων	καθ' ὑμων ὑπερ ὑμων	KM. 114. 116. A partly	καθ' ὑμων ὑπερ ὑμων.
55. στραφεις δε	στραφεις δε ὁ Ἰησους	K. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	στραφεις δε.
59. ἀπελθοντι πρωτον	ἀπελθειν πρωτον	AK. 42. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	ἀπελθοντι πρωτον.
LUKE XI.			
5. και εἰπε προς	και ἐρει προς	AKM. 42. 106. 114. Mti. 10.	και εἰπε προς.
10. κρουοντι ἀνοιγεται, as it appears	κρουοντι ἀνοιχθησεται	AK. 114.	κρουοντι ἀνοιγησεται.
11. δε ἐξ ὑμων	δε ἐξ ὑμων	AKM. 42. 106. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	δε ὑμων.
13. πονηροι ὑπαρχοντες	πονηροι ὀντες	KM. 42. 114. Mti. 10.	πονηροι ὑπαρχοντες.
15. τῳ Ἀρχοντι	τῳ Ἀρχοντι	AKM. 42. 106. 114. Mti. 10.	Ἀρχοντι.
	15. after δαιμονια is added, ὁ δε ἀποκριθεις (or και ἀποκριθεις) εἰπε· πως δυναται Σατανας Σατανασ ἐκβαλλειν;	AKM. 42. 106. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	
22. σκυλα	σκευη	K. 42. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	σκυλα.
28. φυλασσοντες	φυλασσοντες	A. 42. 114	φυλασσοντες αὐτον.
44. Οὐαι ὑμιν, ὁτι	Οὐαι ὑμιν Γραμματεις και Φαρισαιοι, ὑποκριται, ὁτι	A. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	Οὐαι ὑμιν Γραμ. και ὑποκρ. ὁτι.
48. οἰκοδομειτε τα	οἰκοδομειτε αὐτων τα	AK. 42. 114. 116. Mti. 10.	οἰκοδομειτε αὐτων τα.
51. ἀπο αἱματος Ἀβελ	ἀπο του αἱματος Ἀβελ του δικαιου	KM. 42. 114. Mti. 10.	ἀπο του αἱματος Ἀβελ
52. οὐκ εἰσηλθατε	οὐκ εἰσηλθατε	AM. Mti. 10.	οὐκ εἰσηλθετε.
53. κακειθεν ἐξελθοντος αὐτου ἠρξατο	λεγοντος δε αὐτου ταυτα προς αὐτους ἠρξατο		λεγοντος δε α. τ. π. αὐτους ἐφ.

The agreement of these MSS. here appears to be pretty plain. The objections, which may be raised against it, have not however escaped me; I have observed from the collation of other sections and Gospels, that A and Matthæi 10. are sometimes unfaithful to this family, and KM. 106, where they should speak, are often silent, whence it may be concluded, that they have not been collated word for word, but hastily. Griesbach undertook the collation of 114. and 116., but only in some sections for the sake of acquiring an idea of their style and peculiarities.

All this and more I well knew; whilst however I discerned in these MSS. a striking uniformity in many passages, however extensively, however well, or however badly they were collated, I conceived, that a conclusion might be drawn from that which was known, to that which was not known, from that which had been collated, to that which had not been collated.

Though the illustrious Griesbach suggests to me the doubts just quoted[r], I felt their force so much the more, as they had lately occurred to myself. The MS. K. was collated *de novo* by one of my pupils and friends, the result of which notwithstanding, was less promising than I had hoped[s]. Yet, as as far as I could subject these MSS. in general, without a new collation, to a new examination, this much was evident, that they maintained a character of their own, and impart their assent at one time to

[r] Commentar. Critic. in textum Græc. Novi Test. Particula iida. Accedunt Meletemata de vetustis textûs recensionibus. Meletem. ii. Jenæ 1811.

[s] See an account of the *Codex Cyprius*, in the 6th Chapter, concerning the MSS., § 52.

the Alexandrine, at another to the Antiochian, or if we prefer it, to the Constantinopolitan text, they also sometimes accord in peculiar readings. They may therefore for the present stand separated; until more extended researches present the critic with facts, to pass a final decision. Or rather they will continue to remain separated, since, in collation with other MSS. they are singularities.

The Gospels of the Philoxenian version, or the text of Polycarp, also maintain the same character, exclusively of the margin, of which Thomas of Charkel took possession. In the great readings already shewn, they are on the side of Lucian, in the smaller often on that of the Egyptian books, and contain besides peculiar readings of their own. But, as to what relates to their agreement with the MSS. AKM. &c. the version concurs with this family in the passages exhibited from Luke. We cannot indeed ascertain, whether the translator read *ειπειν* or *λεγειν*, *ἀρνησασθαι* or *ἀπαρνησασθαι*, *ἑστηκοτων* or *ἑστωτων*, and so far the agreement is not so striking, as it may be between Greek MSS., yet it is evident, and even in remarkable readings, such as Luke ix. 22. *ἀναστηναι*, 23. *καθ' ἡμεραν*, 27. *ἀληθως ὁτι*, 41. *ἑως ποτε*, xi. 15. *ὁ δε ἀποκριθεις εἰπε, πως δυναται Σατανας Σαταναν ἐκβαλλειν*; 22. *τα σκευη*, 34. *σκοτεινον ἑσται*. K. 42. 106. Matthæi. 10. 51. *Ἀβηλ τον δικαιου*.

But Origen's critical marks particularly attract our attention to this version, viz. the obeli and asterisks, by which it is distinguished from all the versions of the New Testament, like the Syriac Hexaplar among those of the Old. If now the text of the Old Testament flowed from that revised by Origen, we may believe, that the case must have been the same with that of the New, especially as both belong to the same ecclesiastical society, viz.

the Monophysites. We may still further believe, that Polycarp the translator had sought for an examined text, for the sake of applying his labour to a good purpose, which he found better in Origen's recension, than if he had originally burthened himself with the criticism of the text. These considerations appear to corroborate me, since I observed with pleasure Origen's text in the Philoxenian version, and under this guidance referred its origin to the MSS. which accord with it.

A nearer relation of these MSS. to the Philoxenian text, seems to me to be disclosed by the distinctive and peculiar readings of these MSS. being marked in the Philoxenian version with an asterisk. In Mark x. 20. KM., 42. 114. 116. and Matthæi 10. add after νεοτητος μου—τι ἐτι ὑστερω; and in Mark x. 21. after και εἰπεν αὐτῳ—εἰ θελεις τελειος εἰναι, which each time appear with the mark (*) in the text of the Philoxenian version. The same occurs in Mark i. 19., where after δικτυα, KM. 42. add αὐτων: in Luke viii. 24. where after γαληνη, K. 42. 114. 116. Mti. 10. add μεγαλη, in Luke ix. 23. where after σταυρον αὐτου, AK. 114. 116. Mti. 10. add καθ' ἡμεραν, in Luke xvii. 23. where, after ἐκει, KM. 116. ὁ Χριστος, and 42. and 114. something similar; in Luke xx. 41. where after πως λεγουσι, AKM. 42. have τινες, in Luke xxii. 60. where KM. 42. after λαλουντος instead of αὐτου read του Πετρου, in Luke xxii. 61. where the same MSS. read σημερον after φωνησαι, and xxiv. 43., where after ἐφαγεν, K. 42. read και τα ἐπιλοιπα ἐδωκεν αὐτοις, or John v. 4. where after κατα καιρον, AK. 42. add ἐλουετο, which additions each time occur with an asterisk in the Philoxenian version.

None of these MSS. has any longer the critical marks of Origen, and in general no book of the New Testament, but the Philoxenian version has them.

Yet may we easily conceive, wherefore they disappeared from the Greek MSS. The transcribers soon made in the Old Testament such disorder by misplacing the critical marks, that they were forced to think of editions without obeli and asterisks, and omitting these marks, without hesitation to strike out or admit what Origen had rejected or approved by means of them. What the Librarii did in the Old Testament, they were sufficiently unskilful also to do in the New; the consequence of which was the same, that Origen's MSS. were correctly arranged without his marks.

So much for the text of the Gospels. It should now be my office under the guidance of the Philoxenian version, also to discover the MSS. of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Epistles, which have delivered the text of this recension. Nor did I repent of the labour, yet was it without result. The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of the Philoxenian version indeed assert in these their own peculiar character, as we hereafter (§. 76.) observe in the discussion of this version: but in these parts of the New Testament, only a few, and of those few the greater number of the MSS. had not been entirely, but partially and carelessly collated. If therefore among them we meet with none, which are throughout approximated to the Philoxenian version, the cause seems rather to lie in the want of a collation, than in the real discrepancy of MSS. which are allied to the text of this version.

THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT.—THIRD EPOCH.

SECTION XL.

THROUGH the labours of the above-named three deserving men, there was now in various countries a text established, and a stop for some time put to the destructive proceedings of imprudent persons and half-learned critics. This adjustment was not indeed of duration, but it was yet of great and beneficial consequences. Such persons could not complete the confusion, which they had begun. Its growth was cut off, a clearance was made, and they had to begin anew and to work long over again, to bring the text to the state in which they had left it.

It was impossible for the recensions to be maintained long in their original purity, for it was not only customary, but even necessary, for the transcribers to consult a second and a third copy, to correct, by its help, the faults and mistakes, which in any way their predecessor had made, and from which a transcript can hardly be entirely free. For this purpose, they mostly took old MSS. when they could procure such, as the subscriptions themselves sometimes announce: ἀντεβληθη προς τα παλαιοτατα ἀντιγραφα,—προς παλαιον ἀντιγραφον, &c.

From these circumstances, it could not but happen, that a transcriber often met with a Codex of the κοινη ἐδκοσις, and out of it again conveyed readings into the revised text. Thus, the κοινη ἐκδοσις had (Matt. xxiv. 36.), after οὐδε οἱ ἀγγελοι των οὐρανων, the additional clause, οὐδε ὁ υἱος, D. 13. 124., which neither Hesychius nor Lucian recognized, and which

in the third recension also, *in codicibus Adamantii et Pierii*, as Jerome expressly asserts, was not to be found, but the transcriber of the Vatican MS. B. met with it in some old copy or other, and adopted it again.

From this same source the old and venerable monument has obtained again various other readings. Matt. xi. 23., ἑως ἀδου καταβησῃ. D B.; Matt. xii. 48., εἰπε τῳ λεγοντι αὐτῳ, D B., xv. 6., ἠκυρωσατε τον λογον . . . xv. 35. και παραγγειλας τῳ οχλῳ ἀναπεσειν ἐπι την γην ἐλαβε τους ἑπτα xix. 9., την γυναικα αὐτου παρεκτος λογου πορνειας· xxiv. 42., ποιᾳ ἡμερᾳ ὁ Κυριος· xxv. 39., εἰδομεν ἀσθενουντα, &c. Such was the case in Codex C. Luke iii. 16., which with D, after βαπτιζω ὑμας, adds εἰς μετανοιαν, which Origen in his works expressly rejects as a false reading, and which none of the recensions has admitted; and Luke viii. 17., ὁ οὐ φανερον ἐσται, D C, or Luke viii. 42., where C, after ἀπεθνησκεν, reads further και ἐγενετο ἐν τῳ πορευεσθαι, as D and, in part, Marcion have expressed themselves; also Luke xi. 43., where C after ἐν ταις ἀγοραις, as also D 13, 69, 124, adds και τας πρωτοκλισιας ἐν τοις δειπνοις, &c. Luke xvii. 36., δυο ἐσονται ἐν τῳ ἀγρῳ, ὁ εἰς παραληφθησεται, και ὁ ἑτερος ἀφεθησεται, is most certainly not an established portion of Lucian's text; it is wanting in F G H S V, *b h*, and in other MSS. of the better sort, which relate to this recension; yet it has crept again into *d f l r* (Moscow MSS.). The reason is, that it was in some of the copies, from which this recension had its origin, as we see from the Peschito. We will not accumulate examples, which are to be met with in great numbers in the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles; but we will only yet remark that this recurrence to the older manuscripts became also a frequent cause of error to the readers, who noted down again these

readings on the margin of their books, whence another introduced them into the text, or that they themselves, after having effaced the reading of the revised text, wrote them in its place. Through such a correction, for example, in Mark xi. 13., after φυλλα the word μονον came into the manuscript C, which is also to be found in the copies of the κοινη εκδοσις, 13, 69, 124, and in Origen. The same has happened in this manuscript in Mark xiv. 45., to the word χαιρε after λεγει. Through a correction also in C, παραφρονιαν, Luke xx. 23., was transformed into πονηριαν, as D and the margin of the Philoxenian version read it, through a similar C after Στεφανα, 1 Cor. xvi. 15., received the addition Φορτουνατου και Αχαικου, which is in F G; and Col. ii. 12., τῳ (Θεῳ τῳ) ἐγειραντι, which is in the same manner exhibited in F G.

People could not now, more than formerly, leave off making glosses, of which we every where find proofs in the manuscripts. I will take notice only of a single example, which is lying immediately before me: the Euthalian Codex, Acts Apost. No. 40. in Wetstein. has this interpretation foisted between Ἰερουσαλημ and σαββατου ὁδον, Act. Apost. i. 12. [illegible] ὁ τὸ βιβλιαριον τουτο ἑτερος ἑρμηνευτης. in like manner. Act. Apost. ii. 13., it interprets γλεύκους on the margin, τὸ ἀπεστασμενον της σταφυλης ὑγρον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμπελων. which, from a transcriber so very unskilful as he was, who foisted the first gloss into the text, had to expect a like honour. They now also, as previously, read in the Church selected portions of the New Testament, and furnished them where it was necessary, with a formula of commencement or conclusion, which the public reader probably wrote on the margin only; such a conclusion we see on the margin of [illegible] manuscript E, [illegible] the same manuscript

H, πολλοι γαρ εἰσι κλητοι, ὀλιγοι δε ἐκλεκτοι, Luke xiv. 24. In the Moscow manuscript V, these words are annexed to the text by a later addition, in others they are from the first originally incorporated with it. But Matthæi has proved from other data, that here was the conclusion of a Church-lesson. It is under similar circumstances to the addition ταυτα λεγων, ἐφωνει· ὁ ἐχων ὠτα ἀκουειν, ἀκουετω, after πλουτων, Luke xii. 21., which in E and V is to be seen on the margin, but in other manuscripts already in the text. Compare in Luke xxi. 4. the same addition in several manuscripts of Lucian's recension.

In the mean time, the conjectures also and interpretations of the Fathers of the Church, furnished materials for interpolations: we will refer only to two well-known examples. In Matt. viii. 28., Codex C has the reading Γεργεσηνων on the margin, Codex L has it in the text; and in John i. 28., several manuscripts have on the margin, and many have originally in uninterrupted connexion, or as an emendation, the reading Βηθαβαρα for Βηθανια. Origen has proposed the first, John Chrysostom has recommended the other.

But far more mischievous were the proceedings of those, who collated their manuscripts with a foreign recension, and then, as they believed, undertook emendations in their books, and in this manner mixed together the texts of two recensions. In single places this has occurred frequently, and in very many manuscripts; but it also happens, that this mixture runs through whole portions or through whole manuscripts. Had this usage been more general, every thing must now have been lying together in such confusion, that it would be no longer possible to discover and to distinguish the several recensions. The first who carried such an attempt through the whole

text, was the Alexandrian Deacon Euthalius, who, in the first consulate of the Emperor Leo, (as he himself fixes the time, in the year 462) undertook a particular task concerning the New Testament, of which we shall soon treat more in detail. On this occasion he compared the Alexandrine text with the autograph copy of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, of which, in the subscription after Paul's Epistles, he boasts, and prepared for others the materials, to interpolate the recension of his own Church with Origen's readings[t]. He himself did not introduce them into the context, he contented himself with marking them on the margin beneath. I perceive this from the very old and venerable fragments of an Euthalian Codex, which Coislin, Bishop of Metz, possessed, and which appears in Wetstein and Griesbach with the mark N among the manuscripts of Paul's Epistles. In the first of these fragments, 1 Cor. x. 23—29., where in verse 28 the Egyptian manuscripts reject the clause: του Κυριου ἡ γη και το πληρωμα αὐτης, Euthalius has restored it from the copy of Pamphilus, but so that he placed after συνειδησιν an asterisk, which pointed to the margin beneath, on which he gave at length the passage similarly marked with an asterisk[u]. With intelligent transcribers, this practice was indeed without consequences, but the number of such was not the greatest. In a later transcript of an Euthalian copy in Codic. Alexandrino-Vatican. n. 179 (Wetstein, Fp. 46), the readings of which Zacagni published, this addition has not yet crept into the text; but not all the transcribers were so prudent.

[t] Montfaucon, Bibliothecâ Coislinianâ, olim Seguerianâ, p. 262., ἀντεβληθη δε ἡ Βιβλος προς το ἐν Καισαρειᾳ ἀντιγραφον της βιβλιοθηκης του ἁγιου Παμφιλου χειρι γεγραμμενον.

[u] Montfaucon, Ibid. p. 254.

It therefore could not but happen, that in some manuscripts the text of Origen became mixed with the Egyptian.

Others, less considerate than Euthalius, put down on the margin without any mark of distinction, various readings which might easily be mistaken for emendations, and in succeeding transcripts were inserted into the text. So some one acted with the Moscow MS., which Matthæi has named, a 1. He scattered on the margin of the Acts of the Apostles, readings out of the Moscow Codex l. (as Matthæi expresses himself, probabiliores lectiones fere omnes. . . . Codicis l in margine notatas habet [x].) The Codex l however (if it be really the same) follows in the Acts of the Apostles, the edition of Hesychius, as we have already seen.

Still bolder was the conduct of one of the possessors of the Vienna manuscript. Cod. Theol. Græc. Num. cccii. Lambecii xxxiv. It contains the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul, and the general Epistles with the Apocalypse, after the Constantinopolitan recension. This manuscript as far as to the Apocalypse, which has been spared, he has completely overwhelmed with foreign readings, which he wrote between the lines and also on the margin. Sometimes he effaced an original reading, to plant a new one on the space thus cleared, or when he could not easily remove that which was to be entirely left out, he noted it with marks of omission, which he placed above it. When we examine these corrections, we find that they accord with the manuscripts A. B. C. and the Coptic version, or at least with one or the other of these documents, so that the greatest part of the readings thus

[x] Præfat. in Act. Apost. p. xii—xiii.

unwarrantably introduced is Egyptian, and even the whole of them is a mixture.

In this book the traces of the changes are every where fresh and evident, but no longer so in the following. I speak of the Vatican manuscript, N. 367, which in the Acts of the Apostles and the general Epistles has a decided character, and evidently accords with the text of Hesychius, but in the Epistles of Paul wavers unsteadily one way and another. Yet in Paul too it is not so distorted, that we cannot observe that the basis of it is Constantinopolitan. When we examine its deviations, we quickly become sensible, that they are not irregular, that they have all a consistent tone, and that they are Egyptian. Thus, in some measure more or less, has the case been with many manuscripts, from which the oldest documents also are not entirely to be excepted. Of the celebrated Codex A. (Alex. mus. Britan.) we remarked above, that in the Gospels it departed from its recension oftener than its associates, and then for the most part inclined to the side of the Egyptian books. In the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse, it is decidedly Egyptian: we know not what accident might in the Gospels have put into the hands of the librarius a manuscript of Origen's recension, but we may easily conceive, that in this part also, he had by him for collation an Egyptian book. In the Apocalypse the Commentaries of Andreas and also of Aretas gave a peculiar opportunity for confusion in the text. Both were Bishops of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the latter lived in the tenth century, the age of the former is not known, and in regard to it, people vary in their conjectures from the 5th to the 8th century. Their expositions did not suit the readings of every Biblical manu-

script, and yet they were read in various countries, the text must have been on that account frequently strained to alterations, according to the illustrations of these expositors. Their scholia were also frequently blended with the text itself, as we see in many manuscripts. Now since the Apocalypse, besides the usual accidents which befel all the books, was in particular forced to experience these two also, it will astonish us the less, that the later copies seldom contain an unalloyed text.

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORY OF THE ACCIDENTAL ALTERATIONS, WHICH TOOK PLACE IN THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECTION XLI.

SINCE we have attempted to comprise and exhibit the history of the text in its principal points, it is now time for us to devote some attention to other remarkable particulars in our books, which do not affect the existence of the text itself, and to consider what, whence, and of what date they are? in what they can be of service to us, and how far they offer us assistance, in fixing the antiquity of manuscripts, which cannot be a matter of indifference to criticism?

As we at first commenced our researches respecting the history of these books, by going back to that of the writing-materials, so the present investigations also may observe the same order. Their oldest material was the Egyptian paper. How long this may have remained chiefly in use, is not decided among antiquaries, but as to the New Testament, it is certain, that in the fourth century it was already written on the skins of animals. Constantine the Great caused not less than fifty copies to be transcribed at one time for the churches, whose number was daily increasing, ἐν διφθέραις, on the skins of animals [y].

[y] Euseb. Vita Constantini. L. 4. c. 36. Wetsten. Proleg.

Durability, it appears, caused this material to be preferred, at least for public use. The library, which the martyr Pamphilus had formed for the church at Cæsarea, was in the fourth century already much damaged, and to rescue it from perishing, the two presbyters Acacius and Euzoïus wrote over again on parchment the works, which principally required it [a]. Rich persons caused very thin skins to be prepared, and also frequently had manuscripts of the New Testament curiously adorned, as articles of ornament. Some, says the zealous John Chrysostom, possess the sacred books, and keep them, as if they possessed them not: they shut them up in their book-cases, their attention reaches only to the thinness of the skins, to the ornaments of the characters; they have them less for reading than for show, they admire the contents less than the gilded decoration of the writing [b].

This material lasted till some period in the eleventh century, for then paper made of cotton and wool, βομβυξ, βομβαξ, βομβυκινη, gradually became of prevalent use in churches and choirs [b].

SECTION XLII.

Books and treatises, which were designed for a more extended use, were not written with the abbreviations and marks of the ταχυγραφοι, but by Calligraphists, in the greater alphabet, or what was called uncial writing. The older characters are ex-

[a] Hieronym. Epist. 141. Quam (bibliothecam) ex parte corruptam Acacius dehinc et Euzoius ejusdem ecclesiæ sacerdotes in membranis instaurare conati sunt.

[b] Homil. xxxi. in Joan. p. 202. Ed. Frontoduc. Francof.

[b] Montfaucon Palæographia Græc. L. i. p. 17, 18, 19.

actly square, upright, and without junction with each other. On account of its beautiful regularity this writing remained till towards the 9th century without alterations of consequence, but on this very account it is difficult or rather impossible, from the writing alone, without several other helps, to assign to a manuscript a fixed antiquity. In the 9th century, the letters CЄOΘ, gradually lost their round form, and were more compressed for the sake of saving room, some were elongated as ZΞX, under or above the line; at last towards the close of the century, the cursive-writing was formed, which in the 10th century was that in general use. The first manuscript in cursive-writing, with which we meet is of the year 890 [c].

But in the manuscripts of the New Testament, the old writing was retained longer than elsewhere. The Vatican Codex, N. 354. has uncial letters, and yet it was not completed till the 10th century, (the year 949) as the subscription says [d]. The text of the beautiful Moscow fragment of John's Gospel [e], and that of the Moscow manuscript named by Matthæi Cod. g., which contains the Epistles of Paul and the Catholic Epistles [f], as also that of the Ingolstadt manuscript of the four Gospels, are elaborately written throughout in uncial characters, although the usual writing at that time was the cursive, as the annexed scholia shew.

It appears that this alphabet was retained longer

[c] Montf. Palæogr. L. iv. p. 269-70. Montfaucon in appendice ad Palæograph. p. 510 et 514, has pointed out an Evangeliarium, of the year 995.

[d] Birch. Prolegom. in iv. Evang. p. 3, 4.

[e] N. T. ex edit. Frid. Matthæi, after Epist. ad Thessal. p. 257. notit. Codd. The specimen of the characters is in the Apocalypse.

[f] The description is after Epist. ad Rom. p. 265., and there is a specimen of the text in the Catholic Epistles.

in copies for Churches, Evangelistaries, or in books, to which it was wished to impart a more splendid exterior, for the manuscripts of the New Testament of the 10th century, which are written in the cursive style, form by far the greater number.

SECTION XLIII.

The New Testament had originally no marks of punctuation, and remained so a long time, before it received any. The words, as in works of profane literature, were not so much as separated by intervals from one another, letter was strung on to letter, and so continued, that every line was like a single word. He who would read was thus obliged first to separate and combine the letters, in order to form words, and to discover the sense. From this cause, there are to be found in the Fathers of the Church, in translations and manuscripts, words singularly divided and united. Chrysostom, for example, has thus united the words, 1 Cor. vi. 20. δοξασατε δη αρα τε τον Θεον, as some manuscripts read them, δοξασατε δη αρατε τον Θεον. Thus also has the Latin Translator rendered them, portate Deum. Again in συν επισκοποις, Phil. i. 1., some of the fathers read συνεπισκοποις, and commented accordingly; and Philipp. ii. 4. εκαστοι σκοπουντες, is in the Cod. Bærner. divided thus, εκαστοις κοπουντες. The noted Codex L. has (Luke xxiv. 34.) formed out of ΩΦΘΗΣΙΜΩΝ the reading ωφθης ημων. ΟΥΚΕΧΡΗΜΕΘΑ as it stands in the Codex Alexandrinus 1 Cor. ix. 12. Mill has divided into ου κεχρημεθα, but Wetstein into ουκ εχρημεθα, &c.

In the fourth, and also in the fifth century, the New Testament had none of the ordinary marks of

as to this very point directly contrary to Epiphanius. Irenæus closes the passage with οὐδὲ ἓν, and transfers ὁ γεγονεν to the next sentence: as the Alexandrine Fathers, Clemens, Origen, and Athanasius, also cite it.

Chrysostom, on the contrary, considers this distribution, as nothing less than heretical. We must hear his words, for otherwise his assertion, if it be not considered altogether, might be regarded as a Datum, from which something might be deduced in favour of the existence of a system of punctuation. We will not, says he, like the heretics, after the words, "without him was nothing made," χωρις αὐτου ἐγενετο οὐδὲ ἓν, place a full period, την τελειαν στιγμην ἐπιθησομεν.

According to this expression, it might be believed, that the full stop was common in the manuscripts of the New Testament. But what follows shews us that he speaks only in the technical language of the grammarians, and after their mode expresses what was to be done in such a case. He never appeals to the practice of the manuscripts, but after having stated his objections from the context, and then from the incompatibility of the sense with the doctrines of other passages, he continues:—so then let us leave this, and pass over to the usual mode of reading and exposition. And what indeed is this? It is this—To stop in the enunciation with the expression γεγονεν, and then to commence the sentence with the following words; namely,—"In him was life[1]."

Thus every one, according to his views, and according to the instruction which he had received,

[1] Homil. iv. in Joann. p. 42, 43. Frontoduc. Francof. διο ταυτην ἀφεντες ἐπι την νενομισμενην ἐλθωμεν ἀναγνωσιν τε και ἐξηγησιν. τις δε ἐστιν αὐτη; το μεχρι του ὁ γεγονεν, ἀναπαυσαι τον λογον· εἰτα ἀπο της ἑξης λεξεως ἀρξασθαι, της λεγουσης, ἐν αὐτῳ ζωη ἠν.

divided the sentences in reading, no established arrangement, which might have served as a general rule, existing; and that distribution, which Epiphanius regarded as a sin against the Holy Ghost, is found again in the writings of the orthodox Athanasius.

We will yet produce some additional instances out of the Epistles, where the commentators (since several possible ways exist there) have varied from each other by means of different distributions. Theodoret thus divides 1 Cor. xv. 32.: τι μοι ὀφελος, εἰ νεκροι οὐκ ἐγειρονται; Chrysostom concludes the preceding sentence with τι μοι ὀφελος, and thus arranges the following, εἰ νεκροι οὐκ ἐγειρονται, φαγωμεν, κ. τ. λ. The latter concludes, Rom. viii. 20., with ὑποταξαντα, and thus begins the 21st verse with ἐπ' ἐλπιδι; but the former takes ὑποταξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπιδι together. In 1 Cor. iii. 18., Theodoret unites σοφος εἰναι ἐν ὑμιν ἐν τῳ αἰωνι τουτῳ, and explains it, σοφιαν του κοσμου.— Chrysostom reads ἐν τῳ αἰωνι τουτῳ μωρος γενεσθω together, and explains it, μωραν τῳ κοσμῳ τουτῳ κελευει γενεσθαι. Theodoret ends Coloss. i. 11., with μακροθυμιαν μετα χαρας. Chrysostom ends it with μακροθυμιαν, and afterwards begins μετα χαρας εὐχαριστουντες. But not to accumulate examples, let us content ourselves with drawing attention to two passages in Jerome. In his commentaries, which he avowedly composed from the consultation of Greek manuscripts, he says respecting Ephes. i. 5.:—This may be read after two ways, and the expression in caritate either connected with the preceding sentence, or united with the following[k], &c. He remarks nearly the same thing re-

[k] Comment. in Ep. ad Ephes. ad h. l. Dupliciter legendum, ut caritas vel cum superioribus, vel inferioribus copuletur. Cum superioribus ita: ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso in caritate, et postea sequatur prædestinans nos... cum inferioribus autem sic:

specting Philemon, 4. 5., that the word semper may be assigned either to the first or the second sentence, that it is doubtful, and that each mode affords a sense[l]. How could this be, if the limits of the sentences were fixed by an established punctuation?

Theodoret, in his commentaries, sometimes suggests, how certain of the more important passages should be punctuated. In 2 Cor. i. 3., εὐλογητος ὁ Θεος και πατηρ του κυριου ἡμων Ἰησου Χριστου, he advises a stop to be placed after εὐλογητος ὁ Θεος (ἐνταυθα στικτεον), lest any one should interpret it, the God of Jesus Christ. Also in the noted passage, 2 Cor. iv. 4., he directs after ἐν οἱς ὁ Θεος, a stop to be applied, ἐνταυθα ὑποστικτεον. Also Rom. ix. 22., after εἰ δε there should be a stop, ἐνταυθα ὑποστιξαι δει, as if Paul intended to say—*but if;*—then it would be :—God who chooseth to shew his wrath, &c.

Little as one or the other of these proposals is practicable, they yet lead us to the remark, that here and there in manuscripts, at particular passages, after the directions of the Fathers of the Church, a punctuation may have been made by diligent readers of the Bible. So, for example, we see that two very old manuscripts, neither of which is divided by any marks of distinction at that locus vexatus, John i. 3., place a stop after χωρις αὐτου ἐγενετο, οὐδε ἐν, after the usage of the Alexandrine Fathers[m]. When we re-

in caritate prædestinans nos in adoptionem filiorum per Jesum Christum in ipsum. Differentiam vero Græci sermonis προορισας, et ὁρισθεντος Latinus sermo non explicat.

[l] Comment. in Ep. ad Philem. v. 4, 5. Ambigue vero dictum, utrum gratias agat Deo suo *semper*, an memoriam ejus faciat in orationibus suis *semper*. Et utrumque intelligi potest.

[m] This is—the Codex Alexandrin. et Cantabrigiens, Herbert Marsh's, now Bishop of Llandaff (Peterborough), notes and additions to Michaelis's Introduction. Part I. p. 456—7.

collect, with what seriousness Epiphanius has accused this distribution of blasphemy, and Chrysostom of heresy, when we also recollect the old contest respecting 2 Cor. iv. 4., we shall discover the cause, why no learned man, nor grammarian, ventured to give the New Testament a punctuation throughout. A person, contrary to his intentions, might easily favour an error in doctrine, or involve himself in controversies, which he would rather avoid. This department, therefore, being still surrounded by so many difficulties, was obliged to be left to another time.

SECTION XLIV.

It was, however, a really difficult task for a reader, who was not well instructed, to read the Bible well and intelligibly in the public assemblies without any marks of distinction, and for private reading also assistance in the same respect was to be wished. To obviate this inconvenience, the Alexandrine Deacon Euthalius conceived the idea of making a division κατα στιχους, which soon became of very great extent [a]. The remedy which he applied, consisted in setting just so many words in one line, as were to be read uninterruptedly, so as clearly to disclose the sense of the author. We give an example out of the celebrated fragment of Paul's Epistles, which Wetstein has marked with the letter H [b]. The passage is Titus ii. 2, 3.

[a] He himself describes his undertaking in a treatise which Lawr. Alex. Eccles. Zacagni has published in the collectan. monum. veter. Græc. Romæ 1698, 4to. and Gallandus in Biblioth. Patr. et Antiq. Scriptor. tom. x. Venet. 1774, fol.

[b] Bibliothec aCoisliniana Montfauc. p. 259. I have corrected some blunders, which the transcriber had made in the division.

ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΑΣ ΝΗΦΑΛΙΟΥΣ Ε'ΙΝΑΙ
ΣΕΜΝΟΥΣ
ΣΩΦΡΟΝΑΣ
'ΥΓΙΑΙΝΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΗι ΠΙΣΤΕΙ
ΤΗι 'ΑΓΑΠΗι
ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΙΔΑΣ 'ΩΣΑΥΤΩΣ
'ΕΝ ΚΑΤΑΣΤΗΜΑΤΙ 'ΙΕΡΟΠΡΕΠΕΙΣ
ΜΗ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΥΣ
ΜΗ Ο'ΙΝΩι ΠΟΛΛΩι ΔΕΔΟΥΛΩΜΕΝΑΣ
ΚΑΛΟΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΥΣ.

This he called στιχηδον γραψαι, and this mode of writing στιχομετριαν, and at the end of every book of the Bible, the number of such lines was noted.

In this way he completed Paul's Epistles in the year 462, for thus he occasionally reckons from the birth of our Lord to his own days, where he mentions the death of Paul in the prolegomena to his Epistles [p]. Soon after this he also began to divide, in the same way, the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles. As to the Gospels, however, we are not in possession of the treatise, which might give an account of his undertaking; it may now be either lost or be still undiscovered in the libraries. The idea of this plan seems to have been suggested to him by the books of the Old Testament, called στιχηρεις βιβλοι; viz. Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, which had long been so written [q]. This he did in order to fix the sense in reading the public lessons, according to his own admeasurement of the sentences [r]. And, indeed, the want of such

[p] Zacagni. collect. monum vet. p. 537. Galland. Biblioth. Patr. T. x. p. 250.

[q] Suiceri Thesaur. V. στιχηρα. p. 1020.

[r] Κατα την ἐμαυτου συμμετριαν προς εὐσημον ἀναγνωσιν. Zacagni monum. vet. p. 409. 419.

an assistance for the unlearned was so much felt, that the Euthalian division was far and wide admitted or imitated.

In Egypt, where it came to light under the protection of the patriarch, to whom it is dedicated, it could not fail of a favourable reception; but elsewhere too, it found so many friends, that we now possess *stichometrical* manuscripts of all countries and recensions[a].

[a] Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, has added to his Chronology a list of the *stichi* of all the books of the New Testament. Montfaucon. Biblioth. Coisliniana, p. 204. Millius. Prolegom. in N. T. n. 1030. These are written *stichometrically*, viz. Cod. D. Cantabrigiens. Evan. et Act. Cod. D. Epistol. Claromont. E. Sangermanens. H. Coislinian. E. Actor. Laudianus III. Cod. G. Evangel. Harleian. 5684. Cod. G. Actor. et Epist. cath. Cardin. Passionei. 72. The following, and probably many others, in which attention has not been paid to this point, have at least the number of the *stichi* noted at the end. Wetstein's No. 9 of the Gospels, and 13, 35, 39, 41, 45, 46, 48, 50, (in Mill. Laudian. 1.), 55, 61, 104, 116, 117—Acts and Cath. Ep. 30. Paul. 36, Acts and Cath. Ep. 25, Paul 31—Paul. 46, 47. Acts and Cath. Ep. 17. Paul. 18—Acts and Cath. Ep. 33. Paul. 39—Paul. 65 in Griesbach. In Matthæi, who has omitted to notice it in the description of his manuscripts, there are the following after the several books of which, a list of the *stichi* is given: *d*, *k*, *p*, *z* in the Gospels; *a*, *m*, *n*, *g* in the Epistles. In Birch there are: Vat. 354, 360, 356. Urbino-Vat. 2. Barberin. 10, 12, 13, 208. Basilidian XXII. Escurial 9, 10, 12. In the Acts, Vat. 367. Pio.-Vat. 50. In the Epistles, Augustinian. 1, 2. Vat. 360, 367. Alex.-Vat. 29. Urbino.-Vat. 3.—The Florentine manuscripts on the authority of Père Lami are, the N. T. in Bibl. D. Marci. Dominic. the Gospels Bibl. D. Marc. Domin. and Laurentian. Plut. VI. n. 15. Plur. VI. n. 16. Plut. VI. 33. The Gospels in Biblioth. B. Mariæ, and D. Marc. ex hæred. Nicol. de Nicoliis. Acts and Epistles in Biblioth. Laurent. Plut. IV. n. 32, and Bibl. S. Mariæ Benedictin. The manuscripts of the Imperial and Royal Library at Vienna, are the Gospels N. VI. Auctuar. Forlos. XVI. supplem. Kollar. Lambec. XXXI.—Epistles. Lambec. XXXIV.—XV. Forlos. V. Kollar—Lambec. XXXVII.—Lambec. XXXV.—Lambec. XXXVI—XIX—Forlos. X. Kollar. Ῥηματα and στιχοι are found

The greatest part of them indeed no longer adheres to the *stichi*; but contains a list of them at the end of every book, a convincing proof that they are transcripts of stichometrical Bibles. This circumstance is of use, for the sake of drawing conclusions from it respecting the antiquity of the copies, which were the foundations of such transcripts.

But it is also sometimes found, that besides the number of the στιχοι, that of the ῥηματα is likewise added. In all the MSS. the number of ῥηματα is not much greater than that of στιχοι· it would therefore be a great mistake to apprehend ῥηματα as signifying words. They cannot well be any else but sentences, like the στιχοι; and it seems, that in some places these had another name assigned to them, and that in others they were styled ῥηματα. Such transcribers then, as, for the sake of comparison, had more than one manuscript before them, transferred in writing the word ῥηματα from the one, and στιχοι from the other, and united both together, without understanding what they were doing. Although the number of the *stichi* is not stated exactly the same in different manuscripts, and the amount also of στιχοι and ῥηματα does not quite agree, this, too, must not astonish us. For as a manuscript appertained to one or the other

both together in the Gospels N. 9 and 48 in Wetstein,—in Birch, Barberin. 12, Basilidian XXII., Escurial 9 and 12.—cf. Rich. Simon's histoire crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 32. Salmas. Prolegom. in Solin, at the last leaf. As far as I know, ῥηματα only are found marked in the Gospels. Is it probable that Euthalius did not execute a stichometrical arrangement of the Gospels, and that another who undertook this division of them, named his *stichi* ῥηματα? The transcribers afterwards, to avoid giving to these lines one name in the Gospels, and another in the remaining books, might have changed the word ῥηματα into στιχοι. Then στιχοι being in some manuscripts, ῥηματα in others, at last στιχοι and ῥηματα came both together into the copies.

of the recensions, it had in its text sometimes a few sentences more, sometimes a few less, whence, this inequality necessarily took place.

SECTION XLV.

We know, indeed, most precisely, when stichometry originated, namely, after the first half of the fifth century; but we know not when it ceased. But how it ceased, and how, at the same time, it suggested the idea of a regular punctuation, we are informed by a beautiful critical phenomenon, which is discovered in the Codex Cyprius, or Colbert 5149, now in the Royal Library of France N. 63, in Wetstein K.

The stichometrical mode of writing left more than half the space unused, and made manuscripts without necessity more expensive and voluminous. Therefore to gain room, and yet not to lose the stichi, they placed a point after every stichus, and then wrote on, as before, in a series.

In this way is the Codex Cyprius written. After every stichus, or after so many words as were to be read at once, and in one breath, if the reader wished to deliver them intelligibly, a point is placed, without reference to the principles of grammatical division, or the rules of punctuation. We can see this very distinctly in the specimen of writing in Montfaucon: ὁ δε ἐγερθεις, παρελαβε το παιδιον. και την μητερα αὐτου· και ἠλθεν εἰς γην Ἰσραηλ. ἀκουσας δε, ὁτι Ἀρχελαος βασιλευει ἐπι της Ἰουδαιας. ἀντ᾽ Ἡρωδου του πατρος αὐτου· ἐφοβηθη ἐκει ἀπελθειν. χρηματισθεις δε.... Matth. ii. 21, 22[1].

[1] Montfaucon Palæogr. Græc. L. III. c. 6. p. 232.

This, as every one must perceive, is exactly stichometrical; but so utterly ungrammatical, that no one can feel tempted to name it a punctuation.

Yet, the continued and regular punctuation was hence derived. Those who were skilled in the art naturally felt offended with this division, and thence began to improve it, and to incline to distinctions according to fixed rules. Then that there were several who made this attempt independently of each other, is shewn as well by the dissimilarity which prevails through their arrangements, as by the variety of the marks themselves which appear in the manuscripts. There are manuscripts which, instead of the period, use a cross, as Cod. L or 2861, now No. 62 in the Royal Library of France, and Cod. Vatic. 354, also Cod. *h*. in Matthæi; others use it instead of almost every mark of distinction, as Vatic. 1067, Colbertin. 700. The Codex Vatic. 351 almost always makes use of two points one over the other, instead of the marks of distinction. The beautiful Basil manuscript E makes the division otherwise, in which a point on the top of the characters denotes the period; at their base, the comma; and at their middle, the semicolon; which, according to Isidore of Sevile, is the punctuation taught in the schools[u]. Others again, besides the points, or dots, have also the comma, as Cod. V. in Matthæi. The commentaries of the Fathers of the Church, on the more important passages, seem to have served as helps to those librarii, or grammarians, who laboured in this department with judgment and care.

But we can the less decide through whom and when all this came to pass, because it was effected

[u] Isidor. Hispalens. Origines. L. I. c. 19.

Montfaucon, therefore, was unnecessarily troubled about the antiquity of the stichometrical manuscripts Claromont. D. Epist. Paul. and Coislinian. H; and had no occasion, in order to maintain their credit, to take refuge in the excuse, that a later hand had added the accents

The general notion respecting the later use of accents in the books of the New Testament, is derived from the documents of Heathen antiquity, and has caused erroneous judgments on various documents.

Yet, the transcribers even after Euthalius, in stichometrical manuscripts, frequently omitted the accents for convenience, or other reasons.

SECTION XLVII.

THE books of the New Testament have in manuscripts various titles and subscriptions, which, among the casual circumstances of the text, are not unworthy of our notice. Thus, the first book is sometimes entitled, το κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον, or ευαγγελιον κατα Ματθαιον, κατα Ματθαιον ἁγιον ευαγγελιον, το ἁγιον ευαγγελιον του κηρυγματος Ματθαιου του ἀποστολου, &c. But of what date, and whence are these titles or inscriptions? The freedom with which they are treated may at once lead us to the suspicion, that they do not proceed from the authors themselves. From the Epistles of Paul this is indeed apparent. He surely did not himself write at the head of his Epistles—The first to the Corinthians—The second to the Thessalonians, &c. Such enumerations could belong only to the time, when the Epistles began to be collected.

Marcion, who acknowledged the Gospel of Luke under certain modifications, as his own, decidedly affixed no name to it. So says Tertullian, and then

proceeds: Would it indeed have been so great a fault, if he had also invented a title for it, since he has framed the contents according to his fancy? How can one acknowledge a work, which has not the confidence to lift up its front, which displays so little courage, and claims no credibility from acquaintance with the author [y]?

And now, in order to confute him, he does not maintain, as it might have been expected, that Matthew and Luke had themselves prefixed their names to their Gospels; but he rests on the testimony of the apostolical Churches, and of those connected with them by religious unity, which, from the publication up to that time, had assigned it to Luke as the author [z].

So also when Marcion altered the superscription of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and prefixed to it the title—to the Laodiceans,—he appeals against him only to the assertions of the Churches, according to which the Epistle was directed to the Christians at Ephesus [a].

It therefore fully appears, that the communities among which these works were published, added the inscriptions to them, without which indeed, they could no longer be, after all these pieces had been collected into one Codex.

Chrysostom maintains, without reserve, that no one of the Evangelists added his name. Moses, says he in the first Homily on the Epistle to the Romans, wrote five books, and to none of them did he prefix his name; nor those either who related the occurrences after him; neither did Matthew do so, nor

[y] L. iv. adv. Marcion, c. 2.
[z] L. iv. adv. Marc. c. 5.
[a] L. v. adv. Marc. c. 11.

John, nor Mark, nor Luke. Paul, however, mentions himself by name: why, indeed, did he do so? Because, if they wrote to those who were present, it was superfluous to annex their names; but Paul wrote his Epistles to those at a distance, &c.[b] Yet the same writer, so far makes an exception in regard to Matthew, as to maintain that the term Gospel was prefixed to the book by Matthew himself[c]. This declaration is also so natural to the object of Matthew, and so suited to the circumstances under which he wrote (as we have stated in its proper place)—a Gospel is so entirely an intelligence respecting the Messiah, that the Apostle could not announce his writing better, nor more emphatically invite the inhabitants of Palestine to read and receive it with eagerness, than by writing on its front: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

As, afterwards, other writings also of similar import took their places by the side of this, the faithful, to prevent confusion, to the word εὐαγγελιον further added: κατα Ματθαιον. The name Εὐαγγελιον also passed from Matthew to the others, because the similarity of the contents seemed to direct them to the same title, and to distinguish these it was necessary to add to them also the name of the author, κατα Μαρκον, κατα Λουκαν. &c. So the most ancient teachers of the Church cite them, not as the Gospel of Matthew, of Mark, but according to Matthew, according to Mark[d].

These writings in fact were not considered as

[b] Richard Simon hist. cr. du Texte du N. T. c. 2.

[c] Homil. I. in Matth. Præf. δια τουτο εὐαγγελιον την ἱστοριαν ἐκαλεσεν, κ. τ. λ.

[d] Thus Irenæus quotes το κατα Ἰωαννην, το κατα Λουκαν εὐαγγελιον. L. iii. adv. Hæres. c. 5. n. 8. Clem. Alex. L. i. Strom., ἐν τῳ κατα Ματθαιον εὐαγγελιῳ, ἐν τῳ εὐαγγελιῳ τῳ κατα Λουκαν, p. 341 and 340. Sylb.

isolated works, which in different directions aimed at a particular object, but as parts of a whole, which indeed are distinct in respect to their authors, but united in the representation of an individual circumstance. For this reason the ancients sometimes express themselves, as if there were altogether but one Gospel. They name it the quadri-formed Gospel, or one according to four, &c [e]. (διατεσσαρων.)

At the end of a roll or a book the ancients were accustomed to repeat the title of it, that if the beginning, which was most exposed to injury, should suffer damage, an announcement respecting the author and title of the work might be found at the end. This is seen in the manuscript-rolls at Herculaneum [f]. To this also are to be referred the subscriptions to the books of the New Testament, which according to their purpose, were originally nothing but the repetition of the inscription, for example, ευαγγελιον κατα Ματθαιον, Παυλου προς Ρωμαιους

[e] Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. § 6. προσφυγων τῳ εὐαγγελιῳ ὡς σαρκι Ἰησου, και τοις ἀποστολοις, ὡς πρεσβυτεριῳ της ἐκκλησιας. Irenæus, L. iii. adv. Hær. C. ii. τετραμορφον εὐαγγελιον ἐν ἑνι πνευματι. Origen. Comment. in Joann. και το ἀληθως δια τεσσαρων ἐν ἐστι εὐαγγελιον. Edit. Huet. Colon. T. ii. p. 91. Dialog. contra Marcion. Sect. i. p. 9. Wetstein. εὐαγγελισται μεν τεσσαρες, εὐαγγελιον δε ἐν....εἰ δε τεσσαρες περι ἑνος λεγουσιν, οὐκετι τεσσαρες, ἀλλα ἐν. Villoisin compares with it the idiom of the Greeks, who do not say Ὁμηρος του Ζηνωδοτου, του Ἀριστarχου, but κατα Ζηνωδοτον, κατα Ἀριστarχον. Præfat. in Schol. Venet. in Iliad p. xxiii. Bertholdt believes that there is an ellipsis—εὐαγγελιον, namely Ἰησου Χριστου, where consequently a second genitive, του Ματθαιου would be unsuitable, on which account it is called and written κατα Ματθαιον. Einleit. in das A und N. T. iii. Th. § 298.

[f] Joh. Winkelmann's Accounts of the most recent discoveries at Herculaneum apud H. Fueszli. Dresden 1764. S. 51. 52. See Herculanensium Voluminum T. 1. Neapol. 1793. fol. colum. xxxviii. p. 193, et Tom. ii. 1809. colum. xi. p. 25.

ἐπιστολη: sometimes, only προς Ρωμαιους, προς Κορινθιους α', β', &c. So it might have remained for some centuries. But as the Fathers of the Church composed commentaries on the New Testament, they began to become attentive to the time, and to the historical circumstances, under which the respective books appeared to have been written. In this manner Chrysostom and Theodoret, in the prefaces to their illustrations of Paul's Epistles, have from a comparison of different passages in them with one another, and with the Acts of the Apostles, concluded as to the place where, and the circumstances under which, they were composed.

The author of the synopsis, which is commonly attributed to St. Athanasius, assigns the following places, as those where the Epistles of Paul were written—την προς Ρωμαιους επιστελλει απο Κορινθου, την προς Κορ. α' επιστελλει· · · ·απο Εφεσου της Ασιας, την προς Κορ. β' · · · ·επιστελλει απο Μακεδονιας, προς Γαλατας· · · · επιστελλει απο Ρωμης· so also those to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon, all απο Ρωμης: the first to the Thessalonians επιστελλει απο Αθηνων, the second again απο Ρωμης: that to the Hebrews απο Ιταλιας, the first to Timothy απο Μακεδονιας, the second απο Ρωμης, that to Titus απο Νικοπολεως.

Such short remarks, it seems, they sometimes wrote after the Epistles, and thus extended the subscriptions. For the Gospels or other books there were similar erudite remarks, which served for the purpose. The subscriptions however did not receive a fixed form till the middle of the 5th century. It was Euthalius who bestowed it on them in his stichometrical edition of the New Testament. In fact, he has transcribed, (and which ought not to have escaped the editor of Euthalius) verbatim, the summaries, which are prefixed to the respective

books, from the Athanasian synopsis, and with them all the above introduced assignment of places to the Epistles of Paul. But in composing his subscriptions, he has in various Epistles cited quite different places, from which they were sent.

In some of them indeed he is not at variance with the author of the synopsis, as for example in the following: προς Ρωμαιους εγραφη απο Κορινθου δια Φοιβης της διακονου. στιχοι. πικ'. προς Γαλατας εγραφη απο Ρωμης. στιχοι. ρξγ'. προς Θεσσαλονικεις α'. εγραφη απο Αθηνων. στιχοι. ρξγ'. προς Εφεσιους εγραφη απο Ρωμης δια Τυχικου. στιχοι. τιβ'... προς Τιτον της Κρητου εκκλησιας πρωτον επισκοπον χειροτονηθεντα εγραφη απο Νικοπολεως της Μακεδονιας. στιχων. ρζ'. In others however he departs from him, as for example, προς Θεσσαλονικεις β'. εγραφη απο Αθηνων. στιχοι. ρσ'. προς Τιμοθεον α'. εγραφη απο Λαοδικειας, ητις εστι μητροπολις Φρυγιας της Πακατιανης. στιχων. σλ'. more uniformly he has decided, προς Κορινθιους β'. εγραφη απο Φιλιππων δια Τιτου και Λουκα. στιχοι. φξ', of which he must thus have found some indications elsewhere, and probably in copies of the Bible themselves. This was the form which the subscriptions henceforwards kept, and in this they were circulated in manuscripts.

SECTION XLVIII.

The New Testament has also been portioned out into certain divisions, which appear under various names. The custom of reading it publicly in the Christian assemblies after the law and the prophets, would soon cause such divisions to be applied to it. The law and the prophets were for this end already divided into Parashim and Haptaroth, and the New Testament could not long remain without being

treated in the same way. The distribution into Church-lessons was indeed the oldest, that took place in it.

The Christian teachers gave the name of Pericopes to the sections read as lessons by the Jews. Justin Martyr avails himself of this expression, when he quotes prophetical passages [g]. Such is the case also in Clemens of Alexandria [h], but this writer also gives the name of περικοπαι to larger sections of the Gospels and Paul's Epistles [i].

Pericopes therefore were nothing else but ἀναγνωσματα, Church-lessons, or sections of the New Testament, which were read in the assemblies after Moses and the Prophets.

In the third century another division also into κεφαλαια occurs. Dionysius of Alexandria speaks of them in reference to the Apocalypse and the controversies respecting it. Some, says he, went through the whole book from chapter to chapter, to shew that it bore no sense [k].

In the 5th century Euthalius produced again a division into chapters, which was accounted his invention. He himself however lays claim to nothing more than having composed την των κεφαλαιων ἐκθεσιν, the summaries of the contents of the chapters in the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles [l]. In the Epistles of Paul, not even these are his property, but they are derived from one of the wisest of the Fathers and worshippers of Christ, as he himself says, and he only incorporated them into his stichometrical

[g] Dialog. cum Tryph. c. 65. 6. 72.

[h] Clem. Alex. L. iii. Strom. c. 4.

[i] Strom. L. iv. c. 9. L. vii. c. 13. μεγιστης δε ουσης της περικοπης. 1 Cor. vi. 1. f.

[k] Euseb. H. E. L. vii. c. 25.

[l] Zacagni monum. ined. p. 477.

We have spoken hitherto only of the chapters of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. In the Gospels there occur to us κεφαλαια of two sorts, the greater and the lesser. The lesser are the Ammonian which Eusebius rejected, after which he composed his ten canons in order to point out in the Monotessaron of Ammonius the respective contents of every Evangelist. He has explained himself in the Epistle to Carpianus on their use and on the formation of his ten canons, where he names his sections sometimes κεφαλαια, sometimes περικοπαι. Matthew has 355 of these, Mark 236, Luke 342, and John 232. The other chapters are independent of these, which from their extent are also named the greater. Of these Matthew contains 68, Mark 49, Lucas 83, and John only 18. There are but very few manuscripts which have not both of them together.

The composer of the greater chapters is unknown, and their antiquity can only be nearly conjectured. In the 4th century Cæsarius, probably the brother of Gregory of Nazianzen, was acquainted with the Ammonian chapters only. We have four Gospels, says he, which contain one thousand, one hundred and sixty two chapters [o]. Epiphanius in his Ancoratus has exactly repeated this passage of Cæsarius [p], which expresses the number of the Ammonian, but not that of the greater chapters. Of these Chrysostom too knew nothing. In his illustrations of Matthew and John, he often concludes

[o] τεσσαρα ἡμιν ὑπαρχει εὐαγγελια κεφαλαιων χιλιων ἑκατον ἑξακοντα δυο. Galland. Biblioth. Patr. T. vi. Cæsar. Dialog. i. Respons. 39.

[p] Epiphan. λογ. ἀγκυρωτ. p. 490. Edit. Basil. Suicer. Thesaur. V. κεφαλαιον. There should indeed be 1165, but some chapters are a matter of dispute.

his discourse in the middle of the greater chapters, or wherever it may be, and coincides with them, only, when the evangelical history itself suggests such a termination as could not well be passed by. In Euthymius, however, and Theophylact the greater chapters are those generally used. Yet although they may not be any where discovered in older teachers, still this is not the earliest trace of their existence. We find them in manuscripts, which evidently go back far beyond the days of both those commentators.

Their proper name was τιτλος. The titles and chapters, says Suidas, are different. Matthew has 68 titles and 355 chapters; Mark has 49 titles and 336 chapters; Luke 83 titles and 342 chapters; John 18 titles and 232 chapters [q]. What he here names chapters, are the Ammonian κεφαλαια, and τιτλοι are what we have named the greater chapters, as we see from the enumeration. An older document also tells us this, viz. Codex L. or 2861, now 62 in the national library. το κατα Ματθαιον εὐαγγελιον ἐχει τιτλους ξη', και κεφαλαια τνε'. το κατα Μαρκον εὐαγγελιον τιτλους μη', κεφαλαια σλδ'. το κατα Λουκαν εὐαγγελιον ἐχει τιτλους πγ', κεφαλαια τμβ'. το κατα Ἰωαννην εὐαγγελιον ἐχει τιτλους ιη', κεφαλαια σλα' [r]. The errors, which here appear, are easy to be corrected, and properly do not at all effect the matter before us. They probably were named τιτλοι, because to every one of these chapters is prefixed a notice of the contents or inscription (*Titulus*). Whether indeed they sprung from that pious worshipper of Christ, to whom Euthalius ascribes την των κεφαλαιων ἐκδοσιν, in the

[q] τιτλος διαφερει κεφαλαιου. και ὁ μεν Ματθαιος ἐχει τιτλους ξη'. κεφαλαια τνε'. ὁ δε Μαρκος τιτλους μη'. κεφαλαια τμβ'. ὁ δε Ἰωαννης τιτλους ιη'. κεφαλαια σλβ'.

[r] Richard Simon. Hist. Crit. du texte du N. T. c. 33.

Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, we may rather suspect than maintain. They are moreover found tolerably uniform in the manuscripts of all countries and recensions.—Andreas of Cappadocia distributes the Apocalyse into 24 λογοι, and 72 κεφαλαια.

As to the church-lessons, to come back to them once more, various alterations took place in them. As the festival-days multiplied, the old division could no longer subsist, and in many churches the Pericopes were shortened. At last, as the ritual of ceremonies was enlarged, only certain portions were extracted from the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, which sometimes were very short. A Codex of this sort was termed ἐκλογαδιον, in reference to the Gospels alone ευαγγελισταριον, and in respect to the other books πραξαποστολος.

This seems to have taken place among the Latins much earlier than among the Greeks. There are perfectly credible testimonies, which establish such an arrangement among the former at the middle of the 5th century[s], at which date nothing of the kind is perceptible among the latter. The expression πραξαποστολος appears indeed frequently in the Typicum of St. Sabas[t], who died in the beginning of the 5th century. But the Greeks do not disavow, that this Typicum or Monastic ritual was not by himself, that it perished in the invasions of the barbarians, and was composed anew by John of Damascus with references memoriter, to that of Sabas[u]. He lived towards the middle of the 8th century, and with an

[s] Bingham, Origin. ecclesiast. L. xiv. C. iii. § 3.

[t] Leo Allatius de libris ecclesiasticis Græcorum Diss. i. p. 35. in the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius, in the Appendix to the 5th book of the Hamburg edition.

[u] Id. i. c. p. 4, 5. Suicer Thesaur. V. τυπικον.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE MANUSCRIPTS.

SECTION XLIX.

The changes, which at different epochs occurred in things relative to the text and its external forms, are so many data, from whence we may ascertain the age of the MSS. Although they seldom enable us by their help to decide without hesitation the age of a MS., yet may we in general affirm from them, that it is not so old as it is imagined and belongs to a more modern date. Hence, could we not well find a better place to speak circumstantially of these precious bequests of antiquity, than here immediately after the inquiries, which contain the data for forming a judgment upon them.

Yet, have we also another assistance in this research, such as for example the collation of Church-calendars, and Diptychs with the festivals, which are frequently marked in the Anagnoses of the MSS.—also marginal glosses, subscriptions of the Calligraphists, and other additions, which were inserted in books of this nature. Moreover, these are particular cases, which each time appear differently, and therefore cannot be treated or reckoned as general characters. They are therefore resigned to the individual views and industry of critics, some of whom may know how to extract more, others less advantage from them.

Some indications of history, which we yet add,

might serve to determine the age of MSS. written in Alexandria. Strabo mentions two cities, in which MSS. were furnished for trade, εἰς πρασιν, Rome and Alexandria [x], probably the first was the mart for Latin, the other for Greek Literature.

The Alexandrine characters where somewhat peculiar, which however will not develop to us, whence they arose [y]. Among the calligraphists of them there are illustrious names, *e. g.* Philodemus [z], who in the execution of his art became blind, Hieraclas, who more than ninety years old, followed his employment with perfect vision [a], and others as late as the times of the Arabs [b]. But, the nearer we come to these times of decay, the more did the Greeks withdraw themselves from so laborious a mode of earning subsistence; they preferred harassing the country as inspectors, receivers, and soldiers, and resigned Calligraphy to the natives or Copts, as well as all the ingenious productions of art, and hand-labour [c]. To this the Copts so unwillingly submitted themselves, that after the conquest of Egypt by the Arab arms, in the year 641, they united themselves with the Arabs, to expel the Greeks totally from the country, in which they also succeeded after the capture of Alexandria.

[x] Strabo, L. xiii. p. 419. Ed. 1ma. Casaub. ed. 2da., p. 609.

[y] Concil. Constantinop. iv. το συγγραμμα καταρτισαμενος, ἐπι παλαιοτατων μεν τουτο χαρτιων γραμμασι Ἀλεξανδρινοις, την Ἀρχαϊακην ὁτι μαλιστα χειροθεσιαν μιμησαμενος, γραφει. Collect. Labb. T. v. p. 1004.

[z] Anthol. Græc. H. Grotii. L. vi. Epigr. Juliani Ægyptii, 6 et 7. Brunck, Analecta. T. ii. p. 495, 96.

[a] Epip. Hær. lxvii. § 3. p. 712. ed. Colon.

[b] Theophil. Simocatta L. viii. p. 25. Cedren. T. i. p. 405. ed Paris, 1647.

[c] Renaudot, Histor. Patriarch. Alexand. Benjamin. Patr. xxxviii. p. 164.

From this time the Arabs broke off the connexion of Egypt with foreign countries, more especially with those of the Constantinopolitan kingdom [d], from whence the sale of Calligraphical works abroad became impracticable. The destruction of the library at the command of Omar (for, it is a fact, which has been proved) took away from the Calligraphists the exemplars, from which they furnished their transcripts [e]. Both events were highly destructive to Calligraphy. The first limited its use to the continually decreasing demand for it in the interior, the other deprived it even of the hope, though other circumstances might turn to its advantage, of ever again rising to a traffic of importance.

Nevertheless, after the expulsion of the Greeks, there still remained devoted to the Greek worship an oratory at Alexandria, and a Church with a Bishop at Kasr es' Shema [f]. Their numerous Churches the Copts appropriated to themselves. It was unnecessary at this epoch to provide Greek copies of the Bible for the use of Churches or individuals. This state continued from the year 641 to 730, when the condition of the Greeks took a more fortunate turn, and in the person of Kosmas they re-obtained a Patriarch, an unsequestered religious establishment and many of their Churches [g]. Here, a second epoch of Greek MSS. of the New Testament, written in Egypt, seems to take its beginning.

No one will here expect a description of all the MSS. which are known. This might indeed be ex-

[d] Renaudot. Hist. Pat. Al. Chail. Patr. xlvii. p. 206. Isaac xli. p. 187. Simon Patr. xlii. p. 148.

[e] Prof. Keser's Program on the Library, which the Arabs burnt at Alexandria. Freyburg, 1819. 4. p. 2—6.

[f] Renaudot, Hist. Patr. in Chail. Patr. xlvii. p. 205. Eutych. Alex. Annales. T. ii. p. 285—89.

[g] Eutych. loc. cit. Renaudot, Hist. Patr. in Cosmâ.

acted from Prolegomena to a critical edition of the New Testament, and only from those, the wide compass of whose plan authorized this descriptive detail. Here however we are only bound to give information respecting those MSS., to which we have appealed in the history of the text. We divide them into three classes: 1. those which precede Stichometry, 2. those which are Stichometrical, and 3. those which were written, when Stichometry was extinct.

SECTION L.

THE oldest MSS., which have survived to our day, have been probably marked A. B. and C. more from chance than from strong documentary motives.

Cod. B. or *Vatic.* 1209. contains the Old and New Testament, the last in the following order, Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic, then Paul's Epistles as far as Hebrews ix. 14. The Epistles to Timothy, Titus, Philemon, together with the Apocalypse have perished[h].

The book is written on the finest parchment, with most unique and most beautiful square letters, every where uniform, which are scarce observably larger than the characters of Philodemus περι μουσικης, the first of the unfolded rolls at Herculaneum; in other respects they are extremely like to them[i]. The initial letters differ in nothing from the rest: a later hand first wrote the larger upon them.

All the letters are equi-distant from each other,

[h] I have described and criticised this MS., in the program, de antiquitate Codicis Vaticani Commentatio. Friburgi. 1809—4.

[i] Herculanensium Voluminum quæ supersunt, Tomus 1. Neapoli. MDCCXCIII. ex reg. Typogr.

no word is separated from the other, each line seems only to be one word. Where a whole narrative or a greater succession of sentences end, a blank space of the breadth of a letter or half a letter is left free.

The MS. has on each page three columns, and when opened presents six columns to the eyes; so that being deceived by it we think that we see a roll of MSS. unfolded before us, we stand as it were passing from the rolls to the books, in which still a similarity to their original state remains. It is much wider than it is high, and on this account is like to no other Greek document, but the celebrated fragment of Dio Cassius, once in the possession of Fulvius Ursinus.

The book had formerly become so pale, that a second hand was obliged to refresh the characters with new ink. In the Epistle to the Galatians, for example, § 1491. even a third hand appears to have remedied the fading of the second ink. Only in such passages have the almost decayed traces of the first hand continued pure, where the calligraphist has twice written words or whole sentences: we would indeed spare him the unnecessary labour of refreshing what has been twice written [k].

So far do the evidences agree with a very high age, but they fluctuate in generals, without determining any thing in particular.

The stops are from a second hand and ink, and even these are extremely rare. We may go through several chapters of the Gospels and Epistles, ere we meet with one stop. Even where, after a section, the space of the breath of a half or whole letter is

[k] I have selected, as a specimen, two of these passages, John xiii. 14, Rom. iv. 4. Possibly a correct idea of the whole character of the Codex may be formed from Blanchin. Evangeliar. quadruplex. P. 4. ad pag. CDXCII.

left void, no full stop is inserted. Less seldom do they occur in some chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Accents no where exist where the first writing appears pure and uncovered; they have been added by a later hand and ink [l].

The titles are added, as a secondary consideration, in a somewhat smaller hand, in the highest part of the upper margin. They are very singular, and continue at the top of each page to the end of a book: κατα Μαθθαιον (sic) κατα Μαρκον, πραξεις Αποστολων, Ιακωβου Επιστολη, Πετρου ά, Πετρου β', then, προς Ρωμαιους, προς Κορινθιους, without the author's name. The subscriptions are mere repetitions of the titles; what is additional is doubtless from a second hand:—after προς Ρωμαιους, we find ἐγραφη ἀπο Κορινθου; after προς Κορινθιους β'.—ἐγραφη ἀπο Φιλιππων is added, &c. Yet, even these later additions do not recognize the Euthalian Canons.

As far as relates to the chapters, the Ammonian divisions are still perfectly foreign from the Codex in the Gospels; although, towards the second half of the fourth century they were pretty common. Yet would we not strain these arguments unduly. But instead of them chapters exist, which are found no where else, in Matthew, 170. Mark, 72. Luke, 152, and John, 80. The Acts of the Apostles have no other divisions but the Egyptian Church-lessons; some one else wrote chapters by the side of them afterwards, but not the Euthalian. Others, by another hand, have been added to the original divisions of the Catholic Epistles, as in the Acts of the Apostles, but these do not once betray any relationship to the arrangements of Euthalius [m].

[l] Hug, de Antiquitate Codicis Vaticani Commentatio, p. 9—13.
[m] De Antiq. Cod. Vaticani Comm. p. 19—23.

The division of Paul's Epistles is absolutely without parallel. Each individual Epistle has not its particular chapters, but all together are considered as one book, through which the chapters proceed in one. The Epistle to the Romans ends with the 21st chapter; the first to the Corinthians begins with the 22d, and concludes with the 32d: the second Epistle to the Corinthians commences with the 33rd, &c. All these singularities are not merely Ante-Euthalian, but some of them are antiquities, which are to be referred to a far remoter age, of which no one vestige remains.

Two very remarkable things still deserve our attention. The Epistle to the Galatians concludes with the 59th chapter; the following, to the Ephesians, begins with the 70th chapter; the numerical order then regularly proceeds through that to the Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians. The second to the Thessalonians ends with the 93rd chapter. Whence then, arose the deficiency of chapters between the 59th and 70th? Whence this chasm? After the second to the Thessalonians, we obtain the solution, for we here meet with the Epistle to the Hebrews, which commences with the 60th chapter, proceeds with the 61st, 62d, 63rd, and 64th, as far as Heb. ix. 14, from whence the rest of the Epistle is lost. We perceive from the numerical series of the chapters, that the Epistle to the Hebrews stood after that to the Galatians, and then was placed farther back by so novel an arrangement, that they not once thought of changing the division of the chapters. The new position of the Epistle, behind the second to the Thessalonians, is mentioned in the canon of Athanasius. The Epistle probably was thus placed back by Athanasius himself, from regard to the Roman Church, and then must the Codex

have been written about this time, when this arrangement was perfectly new. Yet, if it were thus arranged earlier, before the time of Athanasius, the Codex must necessarily be referred to that earlier period. At all events, the change was perfectly recent; yet was it very common in the fourth century. So Epiphanius informs us:—there were two sorts of Biblical exemplars: some of which placed the Epistle to the Hebrews after the Epistles to Timothy, the others after the second Epistle to the Thessalonians[n].

Basil asserts, that once in Eph. i. 1, the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ were wanting, so the teachers before him declare, and so he himself found IN ANCIENT MSS. Jerome avers something of the sort. See the examination of this question in the second part (§ 115.) relative to the Epistle to the Ephesians. This book therefore, at the time of Basil, must have been an old book, for it has not the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ in the text; they are only written by the side on the margin, yet by the first hand.

The first of these phœnomena transfers the Codex at least to the earliest period of the fourth century, the other most certainly to a considerable time before Basil.

The dialect shews the book to have proceeded from an Egyptian Calligraphist. Instead of συλλημψη, λημψεσθε, λημφθησεται, ἀνελημφθη, we meet with συλλημψη, λημψεσθε, λημφθησεται, ἀνελημφθη, λημφθεντα, &c. This peculiarity only occurs in Coptic or Græco-Coptic documents, as in the Græco-Thebaïc Litanies of the Borgian Museum, where ἀντιλημψεως is always ἀντιλημψεως, and ἀντιλυμψεως[o], in the Alexandrino-Coptic

[n] Epiph. Hær. xlii. p. 373, juxta Petav. Coloniens.

[o] Georgi. Frag. Evang. S. Jo. Græco-Copto-Thebaïcum in Ap- [illegible] 89, [illegible] 64—66.

Liturgy, in which εὐμεταλήψις is provincially εὐμεταλημψις [p], or in other Coptic remains, where λιμψανον is written for λειψανον, and ἀποκαταλυμψις for ἀποκαταλυψις [q].

But, the Vatican Codex every where writes εἶπαν for εἶπον, like the triglott inscription of Rosetta, at the end of the eighth line, συναχθεντες ἐν τῳ ἐν Μεμφῃ ἱερῳ τῃ ἡμερᾳ ταυτῃ ΕΙΠΑΝ, or the Græco-Thebaïc fragments of John vii. 52, apud Georgi, ἀπεκριθησαν και ΕΙΠΑΝ [r]. Just so it writes εἶδαν, ἔπεσαν, ἦλθαν, εἰσηλθαν, and ἀνειλατο, ἐξειλατο, Acts xiv. 10. ἦλατο, διεμαρτυρατο, as we read in an inscription on an inscription on the Memnon in Thebes, ΟΥΔΕΝ ΕΞΕΦΘΕΓΓΑΤΟ [s]; also Luke ix. 36, ἑωρακαν, and Romans xvi. 7. γεγοναν, as, according to Sextus, the Alexandrians were accustomed to do, who used ἐληλυθαν and ἀπεληλυθαν for ἐληλυθασι [t].

We wish not to refuse our attention to these remarks, since we must revert to them in our critique on other MSS.

Birch thoroughly collated the Codex for the Royal Danish edition of the New Testament, with the exception of Luke and John's Gospels. Of these two Gospels he received a collation, which was made for Bentley. Woide edited the collation of the whole book made for Bentley, *in Appendice Codicis Alexandrini*, yet not diffusively, for of so important a document we should like to have more than a collation.

A *Alexandrin. Mus. Britan.* contains the Old and

[p] Asseman. Cod. Eccl. Univ. Liturg. l. viii. p. v. p. 13.

[q] Mingarelli Ægypt. Cod. Reliquiæ in Bibl. Nanianâ, Fasc. 1. p. lxxxiii. We find this peculiarity in the MSS. of Herodotus, and account them Ionicisms; what we here observe, is a mark of Alexandrine copies.

[r] Georgi, Frag. Evang. S. Jo. p. 32.

[s] Pococke, Description of the East, vol. i. Plat. xxxviii.

[t] Sextus Empir. advers. Grammat. i. 20, p. 261.

New Testament. The latter, destroyed at the beginning, commences with Matt. xxv. 6, ἐξερχεσθε εἰς την... but with the exception of John vi. 50, viii. 52, and 2 Cor. iv. 13, xii. 2, it is perfect to the end. The order of the books is the same as in the Vatican Codex; after the Acts of the Apostles stand the Catholic Epistles, then Paul's, and the Epistle to the Hebrews takes its place after the second to the Thessalonians. Each page has two columns.

The characters are fair, square, and upright, greater than in the Vatican copy. The letters are equi-distant from each other; the words are not divided; the division of the word is very rarely signified by a little crooked stroke at the top of the letter. Yet, the initial letters not only stand in a larger form, at the beginning of each book, but of each also of the minor sections [u].

For the book has frequent sections, not unlike to our verses, yet at a somewhat greater length, as a section does not end, until the sentence be completed. A void space of the length of a word generally denotes the end of the section.

We may easily err about the stops, and account the Codex a transcript of a stichometrical copy, since the lines go all through it, and the end of the stichus is every time denoted by a stop: *e. g.* Acts xi. 6, 7. και ειδον τα τετραποδα της γης· και τα θηρια και τα ἑρπετα· και τα πετεινα του οὐρανου: ἠκουσα δε φωνης

[u] With these elegant characters, which have been framed and cast for the purpose, the part of the Codex containing the New Testament was printed: Nov. Test. Græc. è Cod. Alexandrino, qui Londini in Biblioth. Musei Britannici asservatur, descriptum à Godfr. Carolo Woide, &c. Londini, ex prelo Joh. Nichols typis Jaksonianis, 1786. fol. Spohn prepared in Germany an impression of Woide's prolegomena, and executed a correction of Wetstein's collation, according to this edition. G. C. Woidii notitia Cod. Alexand. cum variis ejus lectionibus, curavit Gottl. Leberecht Spohn. Lips. 1788—8.

λεγουσης μοι· ἀναστας Πετρε· θυσον· και φαγε· Nothing exhibits the stichi better than this division; hundreds of the same sort occur in the book, but on the whole and in general it does not recognize the subdivisions μεση and ὑποστιγμη: the final stops alone, τελεια, are observed throughout at the end of the sentence. Each division without distinction, even the smallest, wherever it occurs, has a stop at the top of the letter.

The Codex is perfectly free from accents and aspirates, and corresponds in none of its marks to the time of Euthalius.

The inscriptions and subscriptions are very simple: ευαγγελιον κατα Μαρκον, ευαγγελιον κατα Λουκαν. The subscriptions exhibit these words repeated. The inscriptions of the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles are almost entirely cut off on the upper margin: the subscriptions are; Ἰακωβου ἐπιστολη, Πετρου, &c. At the end, after the Epistle of Jude, the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles have a subscription in common, πραξεις των ἁγιων Ἀποστολων και καθολικαι, as if altogether they only constituted one book. The subscriptions of the first Epistles of Paul are merely, προς Ῥωμαιους, προς Κορινθιους, &c. The subscriptions commencing from the Epistle to the Colossians, have brief additions, προς Κολασσαεις ἀπο Ῥωμης· προς Θεσσαλονικεις, α'. ἐγραφη ἀπο Ἀθηνων· προς Θεσσαλονικεις β'. ἐγραφη ἀπο Ἀθηνων· προς Ἑβραιους ἐγραφη ἀπο Ῥωμης· προς Τιμοθεον α'. ἐγραφη ἀπο Λαοδικειας· προς Τιμοθεον β'. ἐγραφη ἀπο Λαοδικειας· προς Τιτον γ'. ἐγραφη ἀπο Νικοπολεως. The first of these subscriptions agree not with Euthalius, two of the latter, viz. of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the second to Timothy are in opposition to Euthalius, who thus subscribes them, προς Ἑβραιους ἐγραφη ἀπο της Ἰταλιας δια Τιμοθεου· στιχοι ψγ'. προς

Τιμοθεον β'. της Ἐφεσιων ἐκκλησιας ἐπισκοπον χειροτονηθεντα, ἐγραφη ἀπο Ῥωμης. κ. τ. λ.

As far as relates to the chapters, the Gospels have in the first place the Ammonian chapters and the sections of Eusebius, and the greater chapters also have those, which the Greeks call τιτλους. These chapters and *tituli* are prefixed to the Gospels, but in the text they are mostly distinguished by numbers on their places, and the inscription corresponding to them is again added in the upper margin. Thus, Matt. xxvii. 43. is the last chapter, ΞΗ-68., and the inscription on the upper margin is, περι της αἰτησεως του σωμ.... viz. σωματος Ἰησου. There are, usually, of them in Matthew 68, in Mark 48, in Luke 83, in John 18. Concerning the age of these chapters we are now in uncertainty, so that we must renounce their aid in deciding on this MS.

In the Acts of the Apostles we shall have found in five passages traces of a division, viz. a cross, which commonly occurs in the Gospels by the side of the numbers of the greater chapters [x]. But, the cross, where it alone appears, has not invariably this signification, *e. g.* Luke i. 15., viii. 35., ix. 5., xiii. 28. xviii. 8., John iv. 6., iv. 41., where it occurs in the middle of the discourse, or before the end of particular passages:—in these cases how could it denote a division? Yet, it is admitted, that it denotes chapters in these five passages, Acts iii. 1., iv. 3., viii. 26., x. 1., xvii. 20., thus, they at least are not the Euthalian; two of them, Acts iv. 3. and xvii. 20. do not even agree with the Euthalian sections, yet, in all, they must have been not merely five, but forty, according to Euthalius.

The Catholic and Paul's Epistles, as well as the

[x] Præf. ad Cod. Alexandrin. § 36. p. vii.

Apocalypse, have neither chapters nor anagnoses. None of the contrivances and precautions of Euthalius are found in the whole book: the state of the stops, the entire want of accents, the subscriptions of Paul's Epistles are, on the other hand, reasons that they were written before Euthalius's innovations, or before the second half of the fifth century, which reasons are so much the stronger, since the book was written in Egypt.

The peculiarities of idiom shew this origin: Mark xii. 40. λημψονται, xvi. 24. λημψεσθε, Luke ix. 51., xvii. 34., John xiv. 3., xvi. 14, 15., Acts i. 22., ii. 38. 1 Cor. xii. 28. ἀντιλημψεις, Phil. iv. 15. δοσεως και λημψεως, Col. iii. 24. and Luke xiii. 11. ἀνακυψαι. Indeed, εἰπαν and like formations of the second aorist do not commonly occur, as in the Vatican Codex; but the Librarius has not been totally able to disengage himself from them, as in Luke xix. 39., Acts i. 24., vi. 2. εἰπαν, Mark xiv. 48. ἐξηλθατε, Luke xi. 52. εἰσηλθατε, Acts x. 39. ἀνειλαν.

Cod. C. n. 9. *Regio-Parisinus* called also that of Ephræm Syrus, because the more ancient writing was destroyed with the sponge, and the parchment was prepared to receive on it some of the ascetic treatises of Ephræm, but, the more ancient ink notwithstanding appeared strongly through it, so that whole sentences might easily be read. For the old characters had fallen into disuse: people had become habituated to the cursive character with all its marks of reading and division, and henceforward laid hold of old books, for the sake of better applying them to its use.

The pages thus prepared contain passages from the Old, and, with the exception of considerable chasms, which have been pointed out by Wetstein and Griesbach, the whole of the New Testament, in

the same order as the Vatican and Alexandrine copy; Gospels, Acts, Catholic, Pauline Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews after the second to the Thessalonians, and the Apocalypse. Much, which Wetstein could no longer read, might become again legible by the means now known.

The text is not divided into columns. The letters are somewhat larger than in the Alexandrine copy; beautiful, uniform, upright and square; the words are not divided. The initial letters are also found, as in that, at the beginning of the books and the smaller sentences. For, like the Alexandrine, it is separated into smaller sentences, similar to our verses, only somewhat more extensive.

It has also the marks of division:—at the close of a passage, a full stop is commonly found in the form of a cross; the minor divisions are sometimes observed, but generally neglected. For the comma, a stop is placed at the foot of the letter, for the colon a stop is added in the middle of the letter, but a later hand and a different ink has almost through the book written over this stop, a little cross, smaller in form than the cross which represents the final stop. All of these distinctive marks occur in Matt. xxii. 11 and 12. but in v. 13. and 14. no distinctive marks appear until ἐκλεκτοι. In the 15th verse, there is only one after λογῳ; in the 16th there are only two of them after λεγοντες and then after οὐδενος. To give a probable idea of the length of the sentence, let us observe, that v. 11 and 12. together only constitute one, v. 13. and 14. one, and 15, 16, 17. one.

Thus is it with the stops, no accents any where appear.

In the Gospels the Codex has the chapters of Ammonius with the sections of Eusebius. It has

likewise the greater chapters and the τιτλους united with them, or tables of contents. In the Epistles, I remarked some divisions, which agree with the Egyptian anagnoses.

The inscriptions and subscriptions, where they exist, could not be more simple. John is subscribed ευαγγελιον κατα Ιωαννην. The second of Peter has without a numerical mark the inscription, Πετρου επιστολη, and the subscription, Πετρου καθολικη, the third of John is superscribed Ιωαννου, that of Jude Ιουδα επιστολη, and is subscribed Ιουδα καθολικη. Of the Pauline Epistles the subscription προς Ρωμαιους is preserved, the inscription and subscription προς Κορινθιους α', and the subscriptions προς Γαλατας, προς Κολοσσαεις, προς Εβραιους, προς Τιμοθεον β'. None of these have any addition, much less any thing of Euthalius.

If we collate this MS. with the Alexandrine, it has, consequently, minor additions, which we may attribute to a later time. If we proceed in the collation with reference to the distinctive marks, it has not by far so many and so frequent subdivisions into commata and colons, as the Alexandrine: two important reasons to claim for it the precedence of age.

This Codex was also written in Alexandria or Egypt, as the forms λημψεται, Mat. x. 41. συλλημψη, Luke i. 31. αναλημψεως, Luke ix. 51. ανελημφθη, Acts i. 2. ειπαν, Matt. xxv. 8, Mark x. 4. x. 37, Acts xxiii. 14. ηλθατε, Matt. xxv. 34. ελθατω, Matt. x. 13, Luke xi. 2. testify.

In the collation of the book, Wetstein, as Lesz, and particularly Griesbach, assure us, has done all that was possible; yet, were it worth while, by means of the present resources, to have a second gleaning. Montfaucon *Palæogr.* l. iii. c. 3. p. 214. has given a fac-simile of the characters, which however, does not equal the elegance of the Codex.

Codex S. Matthæi Dublinensis rescriptus, a book which, in beauty of writing, yields to none. It was expunged, and other treatises were written upon it, yet not so clean, that the older letters entirely disappeared. John Barret, a man of erudition at Trinity College, in Dublin, perceived the old writing, caused it to be engraved, and edited it in 64 copper-plates, with a preface, critical remarks, and a supplement [y]. We possess, through this splendid work, the Gospel of Matthew, yet with many chasms, according to THE RECENSION OF HESYCHIUS. As Griesbach did not know it, he has not criticised its letters.

The characters are upright, square, uniform, somewhat greater than in *Cod. Ephræm*. The A and M are strikingly like to the form in which we see them in Coptic MSS.

The text is subdivided into sentences resembling verses, as in A and C; but there is only one column in each page.

As to the stops, the final stop was always there, or where it has faded away there is a considerable blank space where it was: but the colon is not always observable; the space of nearly half a letter shews where it once was. The smallest division, for which a space is assigned, nearly like that for the colon, seldom occurs. All three have the same marks, one point or stop.

There are no accents, or to use the words of the eye-witness, *nec habet spiritus aut accentus omnino.*

From every argument decisive of the point, the book is not more recent than that of Ephræm Syrus. To complete the description, we must mention, that

[y] Evangelium secundum Matthæum, ex codice rescripto in Bibliothecâ collegii SS. Trinitatis juxta Dublin, descriptum operâ et studio Jo. Barret, &c., cui adjungitur appendix Collationes Codicis Montfortiani complectens. Dublini in Ædibus Academicis. MDCCCI.

it has the chapters of Ammonius, yet without Eusebius's sections; also the greater chapters and their inscriptions.

I have met with the following Alexandrine forms in it, Matt. x. 41. λημψεται, vii. 25. προσεπεσαν, xi. 7, 8, 9. εξηλθατε.

SECTION LI.

The MSS. of the second epoch, which were written, after stichometry had come into repute, are D., or *Codex Cantabrigiensis* of the Gospels and Acts; E. of the Acts of the Apostles, Laudianus iii. In Paul's Epistles they are D and E, or *Cod. Claromontanus* and *Sangermanensis*, and lastly, H or *Coislinianus*.

D of the Gospels and Acts was used by Robert Stephens in his edition of the New Testament, anno 1550, where its readings are occasionally marked in the margin with the letter β'. The last possessor of it, before its arrival in England, was Theodore Beza; the rest of its history lies in obscurity, and a part of it will also remain there. At all events, it came into good hands. Beza presented it, in the year 1581, to the University of Cambridge, where it was venerated, and in the year 1793, printed in its own characters, which were carefully copied [a]. The pages which are deficient are shewn by the editor, in the preface, p. xxvi., but more circumstantially and accurately in the appendix at the end, as well as those

[a] Codex Theodori Bezæ Cantabrigiensis, Evangelia et Apostolorum Acta complectens, quadratis literis Græco-Latinis, Academiâ auspicante, ... edidit, Codicis historiam præfixit, notasque adjecit Thomas Kipling, (*rel.*) Cantabrigiæ è prelo Academico impensis Academiæ, MDCCXCIII. in two splendid folio volumes.

which, at different periods, were added later as supplements or as corrigenda.

The Gospels are in this order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, after which the Acts of the Apostles. On one side is the Greek text; on the other, opposite to it, a Latin version before Jerome; on the left of the Greek, both stichometrically written with uncial characters. The Greek letters are upright, square, not compressed according to the more modern form, but like the oldest characters.

The Greek and the Latin are by one and the same hand. This is evident in the letters A and E, in the C of the Latins, and the sigma of the Greeks; still more in the letter T, whose transverse stroke is made with a peculiar turn of the pen, and most clearly in the Latin P and Greek Π, in the formation of which the Calligraphist had his own device, in which they both resemble each other.

Yet, the Calligraphist understood little of Greek, and as little of Latin: unversed in both languages, he prepared his book merely in his capacity of a handi-craft man. He was an Egyptian or an Alexandrian. A Latino-Greek Codex written in Alexandria, is an uncommon curiosity, wherefore we would not be guilty of withholding the proof. No Codex, not even the Vatican, has so many Alexandrine forms or idioms, as this: εἶπαν is very common; also Matt. xiii. 48. ἐβαλαν, Mark viii. 15. ὁτι ἀρτους οὐκ εἰχαν. xii. 12. ἀπηλθαν, Luke viii. 34. ἐφυγαν, Acts ii. 40. διεμαρτυρατο, vii. 27. 37. εἶπας for εἶπων, and ver. 40. εἰπαντες, vii. 57. συνεσχαν τα ὠτα, x. 23. συνηλθαν, xvi. 7. ἠθελαν. The editor has noticed in the supplement, John viii. 22. ἐλεγαν, viii. 53. ἀπεθαναν, Luke i. 59. ἠλθαν; nor was he disposed to forget Luke ii. 16. εὑραν, which Wetstein pointed out. We still further remark, λημψονται, Matt. xx. 10. λημψεσθε, Matt. xxi.

22. πιστευετε ὁτι λημψεσθε, Mark xi. 24., Acts i. 8. ii. 38. λημψονται, Mark xii. 40. συλλημψῃ, Luke i. 31. ἀνεληφθη, Mark xvi. 19. Acts i. 2. 22. x. 16. ἀναλημφθεις, Acts i. 11., &c.

If then, as the proofs evince, the book was written in Alexandria, its age may be pretty accurately determined; it was written after Euthalius and before the conquest of the Arabs, in the last part of the fifth or in the sixth century; at that time, when the Greeks abandoned the Calligraphist's laborious mode of sustenance, and transferred the whole employment to the poor and industrious Egyptians, who were neither masters of the Greek, nor versed in the Latin. Cf. § 49.

That the book was adapted to the use of the Latins, may not well be denied, and that it had been in their hands, traces of various sorts remain to prove. Even the pages of the Greek text, Matt. iii. 7. from μελλουσης ὀργης to v. 16. πνευμα του Θεου, John xviii. 14—xx. 13. Mark xvi. 15. from πασῃ τῃ κτισει to the end, which in the interim were destroyed by time and chance, were written again by a Latin hand, probably in the twelfth century.

One of the Latin supplements, Matt. ii. 21.—iii. 8. which Kipling, from the characters, places in the tenth century, might even serve us for a collateral evidence as to the country of the West, in which it was preserved. For the supplement entirely agrees with *Codex Corbeiensis*, which is printed in Bianchini's *Evangeliarium quadruplex*[a]. This Codex, however, was kept in the French Corbey.

As to those who have the idea, that the Greek text has been frequently falsified from Latin books, we may remark, that they may convince themselves of

[a] Præf. ad edit. Cod. Cantab. p. xviii.

the contrary from the Codex at Cambridge, that the Latin rather has been accommodated to the Greek, contrary to all Syntax, with a childish scrupulosity, sometimes even to insipidity.

The Codex has no accents; but that makes no difference, the predominating sign, its stichometrical arrangement, is equivalent. Probably the Librarius merely spared himself a labour, from which the Latin reader could derive but very small advantage. He has his own good reason for not having added at the end the Euthalian numbers of the *stichi*; it was impossible to accommodate them to this old text, which had a number of words and sentences which no longer existed in the revised text copied by Euthalius.

E. The MS. which bears this mark among the MSS. of the Acts of the Apostles, only contains the Acts. In the Bodleian Library, to which it was presented by William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, it is called *Laudianus* iii. Some pages are wanting to it, from Acts xxvi. 29. to xxviii. 6. It was edited by Thomas Hearne, at Oxford, in the year 1715.

The Greek text, and one of the Latin versions, before Jerome, are stichometrically written one against the other on one page, contrary to the custom of other MSS.—first the Latin, then the Greek. The characters are uncial, square, large, somewhat heavy, and much coarser than in the Cambridge MS. The chapters of Euthalius are pointed out by means of stronger initial letters advanced in the margin. The Librarius has also omitted the accents, and the number of the stichi at the end.

This is the second of the Græco-Latin MSS. known, which derives its origin from the Alexandrian manufactory. This is attested by the following evidences, Acts xvi. 20. 31. εἶπαν, xxvi. 15. ἐγω δε εἶπα, xx. 24. εἶπας μαστιξι ἀνεταζ. ii. 23. ἀνειλατε, vii. 10. ἐξειλατο,

21. ἀνειλατο, v. 10. ἠυραν, viii. 3. ἐλυμηνατο, xiv. 15. και παραχρημα ἐξηλλατο, ii. 40., xx. 23. διεμαρτυρατο. On Woide's testimony, *Præf. ad Cod. Alex.* § lxxvi. ἐλημψεν also stands for ἐληψεν.

We hence obtain the same conclusion respecting the age of the book, which was before beneficial to us in the question relative to the Codex at Cambridge; we cannot place it so low as the conquest of the Arabs, and therefore must refer it to the sixth or at the worst, to the first quarter of the seventh century.

During the intermediate time until the eighth century, it was in Sardinia. For at the end of the book is a Greek edict of a Dux Sardiniæ, not written in the hand of Bibliographers, βιβλιογραφων, but in the old documentary or diplomatic hand, which thus begins, Φλαυιος παγκρατιος συν Θεῳ Δουξ Σαρδινιας δηλα ποιω τα ὑποτεταγμενα, ἐπειπερ Θεοστυγεις και κρ.... Justinian, who knew how again to make the power of the Greeks respected in the west, first established, as Wetstein remarks (L. i. *Cod. tit.* 27. *de off. Præf. Prætorio Africæ, leg.* 2. § 3.) in the year 534 *duces Sardiniæ*. But this sovereignty of the Eastern Cæsars only lasted to the year 749, when the Lombards subjected the island to them, and maintained it until the decay of their power and their last king[d]. The end of the *duces Sardiniæ* and of the Greek influence in the island, in the middle of the 8th century, confirms the age assigned to the book, which could have contained the Greek enactment of Φλαυιος παγκρατιος Δουξ Σαρδινιας, to have been during the dominion of the Greeks, that is, before the middle of the eighth century. The edict issued for a religious object, as it appears, is

[d] Cambiagi, Istoria del regno di Sardegna. T. i. lib. 3.

certainly not without year or date, and might probably even still communicate to us information concerning the Codex itself.

That the Codex betrays no attempt to accommodate the Greek to the Latin, but, on the contrary, that for the sake of making the Latin in every way like the Greek, it has strained and unduly forced the Latin language, Woide has shewn by several very striking examples. *Præf. ad Ed. Cod. Alex. Sect.* vi. § lxxx.

D. in the Epistles of Paul has been sometimes considered as the second part of D in the Gospels, and Acts: but the size is somewhat smaller, the parchment is thinner and more finely prepared, and the characters are more elegant, than those of the Cambridge Codex; the abbreviations also, as Marsh has observed, are different in both, *e. g.* in Ἰησους, Χριστος, &c.

This Codex is commonly called *Claromontanus*, and bears now in the French Library the number 107; it formerly was 2245. The beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, and the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews, (the first and last page) are wanting, also in the middle of 1 Cor. xiv. 13—22., which has been supplied by another person. The book has several corrections by many hands, as Griesbach has accurately noticed.

The Greek as well as the Latin text is so written one opposite to the other in beautiful, square, uncial characters, that in the one page the Greek is on the reader's left, and in the other the Latin on the right. Both columns are stichow[illegible] arranged. The Greek letters betray [illegible] y are where it [illegible] h accents.

S[illegible] Mont-

faucon, that he dared not without some scruple, to deprive the accents of the same age as the characters, accordingly he moderated his cautious contradiction by the concession, that at least they might have been added to the book not long afterwards; "*Accentus et Spiritus annotantur: sed ii secundâ manû, ut videtur, nec diù ut creditur, post descriptum Codicem adjecti sunt.*" This is indeed very possible, for according to the observation of the virtuosi, one Calligraphist wrote a book, and another the accents. Griesbach admits, that in some passages, but very rarely, they were added by the same hand. *Symb. crit.* P. ii. p. 32. This could with difficulty be ascertained either from the faded or vivid ink, since the characters have been in many places covered with fresh ink. At all events, according to this assertion, the book originally had some accents, which the first Librarius however did not continue through the whole.

But the principal character of the book is, that it is stichometrically written, and thus its own boundary is defined, which it cannot exceed. But, it can be referred no farther back than the 8th century, if we merely form our judgment from the Latin characters. If however we collate it with the Laudian MS. of the Acts, the origin of which cannot be placed lower than the close of the 8th century, we must assuredly concede a high antiquity to this book.

The Librarius has excused himself from the trouble of adding, at the end of each Epistle, the Euthalian subscriptions and list of stichi. After the Epistle to Philemon there is instead a catalogue of the stichi of all the books of the Old and New Testament, but by another hand, which has also added the Epistle to the Hebrews. A specimen from the Epistle to the

Romans has been given by Montfaucon. *Palæogr. Gr.* L. iii. c. 4.

E. in Paul's Epistles is a MS. which formerly belonged to the Abbey of St. Germain in Paris. It is called *Codex Sangermanensis.* I have not been able to inquire the number, which it now bears, it can no longer be certainly said, whether it still exists [*].

According to Wetstein, it is solely a transcript of the *Codex Claromontanus,* which Griesbach still further has confirmed. From hence he has even determined its age. For he has evidently distinguished several of the correctors, who attempted their emendations in the Greek and Latin text of the *Claromontanus.* One of them even undertook alterations in the Latin with the smaller character. All these, and particularly the last, which disclose a very late age, appear in the text of the MS. of St. Germain. This scholar has referred it, in consequence of these observations, to the 10th or 11th century. *Symb. crit.* P. ii. p. 77. f. The uncial character, according to the specimens in Mabillon *de re diplom.* L. v. T. ii. p. 346., and Montfaucon, *Palæogr. Gr.* L. iii. c. 4. p. 218. was not familiar to the Librarius, but resembles rather a cautious and wretched daubing, than a fluent written character.

I include in this series two other MSS., which have no more right from their age to require a place here than the MS. of St. Germain. It may be permitted to me in this instance to pay deference to their family and extraction, that the following may derive their illustration from the preceding. As in numismatic collections, we distinguish *nummos*

[*] I see from the public papers, that the MS. is now in St. Petersburg, where it was brought by Dubrowsky, Councillor of Legation.

commatis barbarici, re-impressions of Roman coins by barbarians, so may we in this case, and call these books *codices barbaricos*; they are F. and G. in Paul's Epistles, of which we are speaking. Both are Græco-Latia, and transcripts of these exemplaria, which we have already considered.

G. belonged to Professor Bœrner at Leipsic, from whence it was also called *Codex Bœrnerianus*, before it passed into the Royal Library at Dresden. It contains only thirteen Epistles of Paul: that to the Hebrews was not written in it, and in the rest of the Epistles the following passages are wanting, Rom. i. 1—6., ii. 6—26., viii. 1, 2.. xiv. 23., xv. 1., 1 Cor. iii. 7—17., vi. 6—15., Col. ii. 1—9. Christian Fr. Matthæi caused the whole MS. to be printed with all its peculiarities, and has also given an engraved specimen of it [f].

The Greek characters are uncial, but formed in a particular manner. They are very like those in the Psalter of Sedulius Scotus apud Montfaucon, *Palæogr. Gr.* L. iii. c. 7. p. 237., also like a Psalter which I have seen in the Library of the Seminary at Würzburg.

The text is from a stichometrical exemplar, although the Librarius has continued it in serie without setting down the *stichi*. He has indicated the beginning of each of them by an initial letter. Were we to continue the sentence in writing, wherever we thus observe it, the stichometrical division would be placed before us. We will make the attempt with the engraved specimens, without altering any thing of the orthography.

[f] xiii. Epistolarum Pauli Codex cum Versione Latinâ veteri, vulgo Ante-Hieronymianâ, olim Bœrnerianus, nunc Bibliothecæ Electoralis Dresdensis, summâ fide et diligentiâ transcriptus et editus à Chr. Frid. Matthæi. Misenæ impens. Erbstenii. MDCCLXXXXI. 4.

Ταυτα σοι γραφω
Ελπιζω ελθειν ταχειον
Εαν βραδυνω
Ινα ιδης
Πως δει. εν οικω θεου αναστρεφεσθαι.
Ητις εστιν εκκλησια θεου ζωντος
Στυλος και εδραιωμα της αληθειας
Και ομολογουμενος.
Μεγα εστιν το της ευσεβειας. μυστηριον
Ος εφανερωθη. εν σαρκι.
Εδικαιωθη εν πνευματι
Ωφθη αγγελοις.
Εκηρυχθη εν. εθνεσιν
Πιστευθη εν κοσμω
Ανελημφθη εν. δοξη
Ο δε πνευμα ρητως λεγει.
Οτι εν υστεροις καιροις ———

This accurate stichometrical division, by means of initial letters, the Librarius has also furnished with stops, thereby certifying us how little idea of dividing the passages he had, and how perfectly incapable he was of planning merely a few *stichi* on Euthalius's principles. Throughout the book, he has omitted the accents.

The Latin version was made in the times before Jerome, and is inserted between the Greek lines. It is written in the smaller or current alphabet, and with Anglo-Saxon characters, such as Wetstein observed in a Psalter in the Library at Basil, which was of Irish origin, according to the subscription.

The transcriber and his predecessors laboured still more to accommodate the version to the Greek, than it was originally: e. g. Rom. iv. 16. εἰς το εἶναι βεβαιαν την ἐπαγγελιαν, *in esse firmam promissionem*, 18. εἰς το γενεσθαι αὐτον πατερα πολλων ἐθνων, *in fiendo. aut*

ut fieret, eum pater, aut patrem. 20. οὐ διεκριθη τῃ ἀπιστιᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμωθη, *non hæsitavit, aut æstimavit, aut dubitavit diffidentiâ, sed confortatus est, potentatus est.*

The book also appears to have been used in the Monastic schools for the study of the Greek, whence some very scholastic remarks may be explained, as in Romans viii. 5. οἱ γαρ κατα σαρκα ὀντες *qui secundum carnem sunt,* (participium :) Rom. iv. 13. ἐπαγγ· ελια τῳ Ἀβρααμ *promissio* (dativus) *Abrahæ.*, &c. But we cannot enter further into these illustrative remarks, and are contented, hence to lead others to observe how little the theory of those, who represent the falsification of the Greek MSS. from the Latin, as a principle in the history of the text, is confirmed.

From what has been already said we readily perceive that the Bœrnerian Codex is a transcript of an old copy, the Greek text of which is stichometrically written with uncial characters, on the side of which was a version before Jerome, probably after a copy which resembles the Clarmont MS., and might have exceeded it in age.

The copy from which our Codex is derived, was written, like the Græco-Latin MSS. D. and E., in Alexandria, which the idiomatic variations occurring in it attest abundantly. Rom. ii. 11. Ephes. vi. 9. Col. iii. 25. προσωπολημψια, Phil. iv. 15. δοσεως και λημψεως, 1 Tim. iv. 3. μεταλημψις, Rom. xi. 15. προλημψις, 1 Cor. xii. 28. ἀντιλημψις, 1 Tim. iii. 2., v. 7., vi. 14. ἀνεπιλημπτον, Rom. xiii. 2. λημψονται, Gal. vi. 1. προλημφθη, 2 Thess. ii. 13. ὁτι εἱλατο ὑμας, 2 Cor. v. 17. γεγοναν, Rom. xv. 3. ἐπεπεσαν, 2 Cor. vi. 17. ἐξελθατε.

The copy was made in the tenth, or very early in the ninth century, since, on its margin, it is frequently remarked by the first hand, " contra Γοδδισκαλκον, contra Græcos." The former unfolded his doctrines

one of those, which were in circulation before Jerome.

Wetstein believed G to have been a transcript of this, but nothing opposes the reverse of the case. However, in F. there is a stop after each word, and consequently each is divided from the other by this mark, and each has its boundary; whereas, on the contrary, G. was copied from a MS. which had no divisions of words. We may perceive this from the following examples: 1 Cor. iv. 21. G. thus divides the words, πνευματι τε-πρα, οτητος. 1 Cor. viii. 7. ἀσθενης οὐς. αμολυνεται, ix. 12. ἱνα μη ἐν κοπτηντιν αδωμεν, xv. 33. φθειρουσιν η. θεαχρησ. τα ὁμιλιαι. On the other hand, MS. F. is not copied from G: for the mode of writing in columns is that authorized in the older MSS., whereas we have no ancient examples of the custom adopted in G., G. has also many peculiar readings, which do not occur in Codex F.

Yet, it is striking how often they agree in minutiæ and errors, so that the dependence of both MSS. on each other can with difficulty be contradicted. However, these irreconcileable singularities all through them can only be explained by our admission, that the basis of both was a common original MS., which, according to the custom of the age, had various corrections, of which one copyist chose one reading, another the other, and adopted it in his text.

The MS. at Reichenau is nearly as old as the Bœrnerian; for, the passage, "*post illam generalem baptismi Gratiam,*" which, as Semler has remarked, was taken from Rhabanus Maurus, and appended at the end of the Reichenau Codex, is by the first hand. It cannot, therefore, well have been written earlier, than in the last half of the ninth, or in the tenth century.

These MSS. have not wandered into our country,

although probably here they originated. In the seventh century, numerous emigrants from Ireland, and partly from Scotland, came to us; they settled here, and were the fathers and founders of our monastic institutions and abbies. Thus came Gallus, Columban, Fridolin, Trudpert, Pirmin, and others, and in the sequel attracted from their native land other scholars; from whence we sometimes observe in our monastic libraries books in the Anglo-Saxon character. The latter individuals probably brought with them the knowledge of the Greek tongue; thus we obtained Græco-Anglo-Saxon MSS. For towards the end of the seventh century, Theodore, a Greek by birth, educated at Athens, was received into the priesthood in Italy, and afterwards sent by the Pope with archiepiscopal authority to Britain[g]. By his means, the British monasteries were enabled to know the Greek language.

Codex H. was a very beautiful stichometrical MS., from which, in the celebrated library of Bishop Coislin, at Metz, No. 202, fragments of the Pauline Epistles were preserved, which Montfaucon caused to be printed, and Griesbach *de Novo* examined[h]. The catalogue of them is found in his manual edition of the New Testament: there is a specimen in Montfaucon.

In earlier times, the Codex was kept at Mount Athos, where it was applied, as old parchment, to the binding of other books, in the year 1218, as it is evi-

[g] Epist. Zachariæ ad Bonifacium (apud Harzheim concilia Germaniæ, T. i. p. 84.) in gentem Anglorum et Saxonum in Britanniâ insulâ primi prædicatores ab sede Apostolicâ missi, Augustinus, Laurentius, Justus, et Honorius, novissimè et tuis temporibus Theodorus Græco-Latinus, ante Philosophus et Athenis eruditus, Romæ ordinatus, pallio sublimatus ad præfatam Britanniam transmissus judicabat et gubernabat.

[h] Montfaucon, Biblioth. Coislin. P. ii. p. 253-63. Griesbach, Synop. Crit. P. ii. p. 85.

dent from a note of the book, to which it was forced to serve as a binding.

It is entirely in Greek, with very large genuine square characters of the old sort, commonly called stichometrical, and is written with accents. It had also the Euthalian subscriptions, one of which is remaining after the Epistle to Titus: ἐπιστολη προς Τιτον της Κρητων ἐκκλησιας—κ. τ. λ.

Montfaucon concludes from the note, ἀντεβληθη ἡ Βιβλος προς το ἐν Καισαρειᾳ ἀντιγραφον της βιβλιοθηκης του ἁγιου Παμφιλου χειρι γεγραμμενον, which appeared at the end of the book, that it was written in Syria. But this postscript belongs to Euthalius, not to the Librarius. On the other hand, ἐνκαταλημτον, in the fourth and fifth line of the subscription, is Alexandrine; whence the book, from its genuine ancient characters, must have been written in the sixth century, before the irruption of the Arabs. Cf. § 49.

SECTION LII.

We now proceed to the MSS. which arose after stichometry, and among them we give the first rank to the Codex K., which was brought from Cyprus in the year 1637, and thence called Cyprius. It was *Colbertin.* 5149., and now is N. 63. in the Bibliotheque du Roi in Paris[1]. We have conceded to it the first place, because it plainly informs us how the transition from stichometry to proper stops, was effected. Cf. § 45. It was not indeed itself co-æta-

[1] Scholz has more expressly described and collated it de novo. Commentatio inauguralis de Codice Cyprio, et familiâ, quam sistit. ed. Jo. Mart. Augustin Scholz, curis criticis in Historiam textus Evangeliorum, 4. Heidelbergæ, 1820, *at the end.*

specimen, which have been engraved pretty accurately, and under the superintendence of the late Prof. Herzog. A regular interpunction proceeds through the whole book: the full stop is introduced above, at the top of the letter; the middle division, (the colon) about the middle of the letter; the smallest, at the bottom of the line, is a dot, which is sometimes lengthened into a manifest comma. The words are furnished with accents, which have been here and there forgotten. The text, as in *Codd.* A. C. is divided into parts after the manner of verses.

But around the text characters of other times are seen, and an uncial character of the ninth century is the predominant, not like to that of *Cod.* L. with all the compressed and elongated letters, as they appear in MSS. of this century. In this character are the syllabi of the chapters, τιτλοι, which are prefixed to the Gospels, the pages of which, as may clearly be seen, were put together, and bound one by one. By the same, or a cotemporary hand, are the notices of the Ammonian periods on the side, and in the lower margin the indices, in which Evangelist this narrative may again be found, as well as the notices of the festivals, on which certain sections were read, *e. g.* as at the beginning of Matthew: εις τα αγια Θεοφανια, τ̄ μετα φωτα, μετα την τ̄ αγιων παντων, &c.

Both characters occur in the middle of the same line, or immediately under one another. The festivals are very seldom marked in the old character: the specimen contains one of these rare instances, in the words τη μεγαλη Κυριακει: much more frequently there are found in this hand certain commencing forms of Church-lessons, before remarked in the upper-margin; *e. g.* on the 70th page, τω καιρω εκεινω ελαλησεν ὁ Ῑς; on the 90th, εισηλθεν ὁ Ῑς εις Καπερναουμ; on the 100th, τω καιρω εκεινω επορευετο ὁ Ῑς

τοις Σαββασιν, &c. These commencing forms are often advanced far into the page, so that before them remains a blank space, for the purpose of writing something additional, of which the calligraphist of the second character took possession: thus, p. 110, the introduction τῳ καιρῳ ἐκεινῳ ἠκουσεν Ἡρωδης ὁ Βασιλευς την ἀκοην του Ιου is in the ancient character; in the second character, the words εἰς την ἀποτομην του προδρομου are prefixed, or p. 158, the formulary, τῳ καιρῳ ἐκεινῳ ἠλθεν is in the ancient character, before which is the τιτλος—περι του ἐχοντος πνευμα Δαιμονιου in the more modern.

Where these are not carefully separated, the judgment will be led astray, by which means the body of the book will be deformed, which is of a far greater age than these additaments, which hover around the text. A book which in the ninth century has received these additions and augmentations, must so much the rather be retraced beyond the ninth century, as its characters bear in them infallible marks of a higher antiquity. It will not be objected to me, that the calligraphist may have probably conceived the idea of imitating a more ancient character. There is nothing of imitation in it: every letter is bold; each stroke is drawn by a surer hand: it is the writing of a practised, not of a copying calligraphist. I know one such a book of the four Gospels, formerly in the possession of Chevalier Nani, now by his kindness in the Library of St. Mark. Undeniable evidences prove it to have been written about the tenth century, for the letters ϹϵΟΘ in it are still as rounded as in the most ancient MSS. But the cautious and insecure hand alone which guided the calamus or pen, is too self evident: we perceive the thin and thick unsteady strokes, as they were gradually thickened by repeated traces, &c. No one can shew any thing of

this sort in the Codex at Basil, they are genuine characters of the eighth century, in which it is written. But I do not venture to refer it to a higher age; since in the more ancient writing, if the calligraphist was pressed for room at the end of a line, he made the letters smaller; but this Codex avoids this, for it compresses the letters, and makes them smaller, which is mostly remarkable in C Є O, and may be regarded as a prelude to the alterations of the ninth century.

This MS. had its abode in Constantinople or its vicinity. Not to be too diffuse, I appeal only to two proofs. In Matthew the festival is entitled *των ἁγιων ἀναργυρων*. These moneyless saints are Cosmas and Damian, who practised medicine GRATUITOUSLY [k]. They possessed in the other half of the 6th century a temple in Constantinople, through the favour of Justin the second, and Sophia his wife [l]. In Luke this occurs on the margin, *εἰς την μνημην των ἁγιων νοταριων*. These were exclusively Constantinopolitan saints, who perished in the insurrection, which Macedonius excited, and were then accounted martyrs, over whose tombs a Church was built, which yet stood in the days of Sozomen [m].

The Codex therefore had its abode in Constantinople or its environs, and served as a Church-book, on which account it had in the hand of the writer the indices of the Church-lessons, and their introductory formularies. In this case it might easily

[k] Suicer, Thesaur. Phil. V. *ἀναργυρος*. Balsamon, Schol. ad Photii Nomoc. tit. vii. c. 2. in Biblioth. juris Canon. Voell. et Justell. T. i. p. 623.

[l] Anonym. apud Bandur. in Antiquit. Imperii Orient. P. ii. T. i. p. 30. cf. Notas in hunc locum. T. ii. p. 624-25.

[m] Sozom. Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 3. cf. Valesii Notas in hunc locum. et in Socratis Hist. Eccl. L. v. c. 22.

want the τιτλος or Ammonian sections, until it pleased a second hand, to enrich it with them and with the indices of the sacred festivals.

If we have rightly placed the origin of this book in the 8th century, it cannot well be denied, that a perfect system of stops was introduced, at least in some countries.

L. once 2861, now 62 at Paris in the Bibliotheque du Roi, contains the four Gospels on parchment, elegantly written with uncial characters in two columns, but not with the former old and square writing, as it is called: CЄOΘ are compressed; Z, Ξ, X, are elongated under the line, Λ has its small strokes under it, and the cross-stroke of Θ, is, as may be seen from the specimen, exactly as I have drawn it, in which however the engraver might have done something more. It has accents, which however are carelessly placed, and are often entirely wanting. It accomplishes the punctuation by two marks,—the greater and middle division by a cross, the smallest by a comma.

Wetstein has collated the book, and after him Griesbach, who has also given a description of it*, collated it with particular attention. It bears infallible marks of its country with it. Griesbach remarks on the orthography of the book: "semper scribitur λημψομαι cum conjugatis pro ληψομαι, et sæpissimè ειπαν pro ειπον, nonnunquam etiam ηλθαν et ισαν." We also find ιδαν for ειδον, Luke ix. 32. and x. 24.—εξηλθατε for εξεληλυθατε, Luke vii. 24., xxii. 52.—Also, ευραν, ευραμεν for ευρον and ευρομεν, Luke ii. 16. and xxiii. 2.—and εωρακαν for εωρακασιν, Luke ix. 36. From hence we see that it is Egyptian, and from the characters that it is an Egyptian book of the second epoch, § 49. Griesbach has placed it

* Griesbach, Symbol. Critic. Tom. i. p. lxvi.—lxxix.

in the 9th century, in which I entirely agree with him.

V. containing the four Gospels is in the Library of the Holy Synod at Moscow, where it is regarded as the most ancient document among the Library treasures preserved there. It is defective, in Matt. v. 44.—vi. 12., ix. 18.—x. 1., xxii. 44.—xxiii. 35. Mark and Luke are perfect, but in John vii. 39. a new hand commences, which has continued its labour to the end and added a subscription: but this is so little calculated to determine the age of the book in any respect, that Matthæi without difficulty immediately demonstrated it to be inadmissible for this purpose.

The writing is uncial, or, if the word be here displeasing, the letters are those of the greater (or capital) alphabet, which are executed very small and uncommonly elegant. The letters are not much greater than in the Hexaplar MS. of the Prophets belonging to Cardinal Barberini; but they have a more oblong form[°]. The MS. is, as the specimen shows, which Matthæi has published with the Apocalypse, written στιχηρως, although in *serie continuâ*, nevertheless it is divided into sentences very similar to verses. The beginning of Mark is engraved as a specimen.

The book has besides the accents a regular punctuation all through it: for the full stop, a point or dot at the top of the letter, for the middle division a dot at the foot of the letter, and for the smallest division, the comma. The form and elegance of the characters place the part as far as John vii. 39. in the 9th century. The sequel is several cen-

[°] Bianchini Evang. quadr. P. i. ad pag. DXXXII. Cod. Barb. sign. num. v.

turies junior. The book, as a credible person assures me, was saved with the other MSS. from the burning of Moscow. Matthæi gives a description of it in the Appendix ad Thessalonicens. p. 265.

g. of the Holy Synod xcviii., formerly in the Monastery of St. Dionysius on Mount Athos contains all the Pauline and Catholic Epistles. The Catholic have a Catena, but the Pauline the Scholia of Johannes Damascenus. The text is written in two columns, with uncial characters, accents, and punctuation. It seems, that the dot above the letter is the full stop, that in the middle, the middle division, that below, the smallest or the comma.

The Catena and Scholia appear in cursive characters, on which account the book could hardly have been written before the tenth century. The description of it is after Matthæi Epist. ad Rom. Tit. et Philem. p. 265—67. and the specimen is selected from the Catholic Epistles.

b. is an Evangelistarium in the Library of the Holy Synod N. xliii. in two columns, with uncial characters and accents, and if we may judge from the specimen, badly punctuated, and full of errors of the pen. The strokes are pretty thick, yet not badly devised. They are very like another Evangeliarium of the year 995, apud Wetstein, N. 5. of which Montfaucon *in Append. ad Palæogr.* has given a copy, where he calls its possessor Coxel, which may perhaps be Covel. The description of the Moscow Codex is in Matthæi Epist. ad Thessalonic. p. 252., where also a specimen is found.

h. is an Evangelistarium in the press of the Holy Synod. N. xii., the beginning of which (some lessons from John) is injured. It is written in two colums, with oblong great uncial characters, accents and stops. The smaller division, according to the speci.

men, is effected by a stop, which nearly lengthens itself into a line: the full stop is expressed by a cross. On the whole the book is very correct, and written by a competent Librarius. The characters have the greatest similarity to an Evangeliarium (*Colbert* 700. *Wetstein*, N. 1.) of which a page is copied by Montfaucon, Palæogr. L. iii. c. 4. p. 229. Montfaucon is inclined to place it in the 8th century. Had he only proved, that then there was a regular punctuation, we might assent to him: but without the production of valid proof for so important a documentary relic, the 9th century is more appropriate to MSS. of this description. Matthæi has given a description and specimen of it, *ad Thessalonic.* p. 253-54.

M. was once the property of Abbè des Camps; now it is in the Bibliotheque du Roi, N. 48.:—it contains the four Gospels in uncial characters, with accents and stops. The MS. has likewise other marks in red ink above the lines, which seem to be notes, according to which the Gospels were chaunted in the Churches. It has also laboured characters, and various readings, according to all appearance, by the first hand, in cursive writing in the margin. From these criteria, it may not be referred beyond the 10th century. The specimen is in Montfaucon, Palæogr. L. iii. c. 8. p. 260.

SECTION LIII.

We have now at least briefly to notice some remarkable MSS. in the cursive alphabet, which we have cited in the history of the text. First, we would adduce the Gospels.

1. of the Gospels apud Wetstein and Griesbach

bears the Mark B. vi. 27. in the Library at Basil, and is an elegant MS. adorned with pictures. It contains the whole New Testament, (except the Apocalypse) which however is so arranged, that the Acts and Epistles precede, and the Gospels follow. Before the Gospel of John the resuscitation of Lazarus is depicted: by the side of Jesus are two crowned figures of men clothed in purple and gold, one represented old and grey bearded, the other juvenile. Under the picture is a Greek epigram, from which we see, that one of the Leos is here drawn; and Wetstein has shewn from some other observations, that Leo the Wise, and his son Constantine Porphyrogenetus are the two crowned personages, under whom this book was written, probably for the use of the Church of St. Lazarus, which Leo erected. Leo however lived at the close of the 9th and beginning of the 10th century. The text of the Gospels is very different from the text of the other parts of the book.

10. in the edition of P^{r}. Matthæi, is M^{t}. 10. in Griesbach. This MS. is in the Library of Archbishop Nicephorus of Cherson, and contains the four Gospels accompanied by Scholia. According to the subscription after the Gospel of Luke it was presented by the Librarius Moses, the son of Elias, to the Monastery of the Votaries of St. Michael in Jerusalem. This fact corroborates our assertion concerning the text of the MS., that it was copied from an exemplar of the Palæstinian recension.

It is written on parchment with cursive characters, accents, and stops in folio. The commencing letters, the catalogue of contents of the Gospels, their inscriptions, the Eusebian Canons and great chapters on the margin, are depicted in letters overlaid with gold, and red paint. The

whole book is in excellent preservation, correct, and apparently splendid. At all events it was written before the Crusades, before the end of the 11th century, during which and afterwards, no such a book could again be expected to have been written in Jerusalem. Matthæi has described it after *Epp. ad Thessalonic.* p. 234-37. the specimen is taken from Luke.

114, according to Griesbach's marks, or Harleian 5540. contains the Gospels on parchment, written with small elegant writing in the thirteenth century. It has only been carefully collated in Matt. viii. ix. x. xi.: every where else the collation has been hasty. In this book, Matt. xvii. 4-18. and xxvi. 57-73, are wanting. Griesbach, Symb. crit. P. i. p. clxxxxiii.

124, according to Griesbach, is in the Royal Library at Vienna, *Lambec.* xxxi. 4. At the end of each Gospel, στιχοι and ῥηματα are observed at the same time. The cursive character is not elegant, and the commencing letters are coarse. The description, and an engraved specimen of it, together with excellent remarks on its text, are given by Treschow in Tentam. Descriptionis Codicum Vet. Græc. Nov. Fæd., qui in Biblioth. C. Vindob. asservantur. Hauniæ. 1773. § 4. Birch, who also has collated this book, places it in the eleventh or twelfth century. Proleg. in edit. iv. Evangel. p. lviii.

1. a MS. apud Matthæi, of which the notices are scattered here and there: after his edition of Epp. ad Thessalon. p. 187. Præfat. ad Acta. App. p. x. Præf. in Epp. Cathol. p. xxv. The specimen is in Epist. ad Rom. It contains the whole New Testament and Psalter, together with the Canticles, in extremely small cursive characters, with accents,

stops, and pictures of the Evangelists and Apostles. The text of the Acts of the Apostles, on which account it is here principally quoted, is from a totally different recension to the remaining parts of the book. The MS. bears in the Library of the Holy Synod, numb. ccclxxx., and in the estimation of the scholar, who has collated it, belongs to the twelfth century.

Vatic. 367. contains the Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic and Pauline Epistles in 4., and is probably referible to the 12th century. Birch, Variæ Lectiones ad text. Act. App. Epp. Catholic. et Pauli. Hauniæ. 1798. Prolegom. p. ix. The book has, in the Acts of the Apostles and Catholic Epistles, a pure text; but in Paul it has been much disfigured by the consultation of other MSS. and foreign readings.

17. apud Wetstein and Griesbach in Paul's Epistles, was formerly *Colbert*. 2844. and is now N. 14. in the Bibliotheque du Roi at Paris. The MS. contains extracts from the Prophets and the whole New Testament, with the exception of the Apocalypse. It is bound, and begins with the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and proceeds in the series as far as Philemon inclusive. The Epistle to the Hebrews has its place before that to Timothy. The Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Romans, follow Philemon, then the Catholic Epistles, and lastly the Gospels. Otherwise it is well written, and belongs to the tenth or eleventh century. The Epistles of Paul are especially worthy of our notice, in the Gospels it bears in Wetstein numb. 133., and in the Acts of the Apostles and Catholic Epistles, 13. Griesbach. Symb. critic. T. i. p. clxvi. Observations on the text of Paul's Epistles are found in Griesbach's Symb. critic.

T. ii. p. 87-148. and Begtrup has made selection of various readings, which Birch has published in Supplem. after Variæ Lectiones ad textum Apocalyps. Hauniæ. 1800. p. 95.

The Vatican MS. 579. contains among various other treatises, also the Apocalypse; it is written on cotton paper, some time in the thirteenth century. Consequently it is not ancient; but it is derived from a pure and well-preserved exemplar. Yet the Librarius made preparations to subject the text to his corruptions, for he compiled various readings from another book, and specified them in the margin. In the next copy they probably would have been introduced as improvements: perhaps he may have indeed done this in some passages, unless it happened at an earlier period: for the MS. occasionally varies from its family. Birch. Var. Lectiones ad text. Apocalyps. p. ix—xii.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EDITIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECTION LIV.

A BEAUTIFUL discovery released the transcribers from their toilsome employment; and who would not have thought that they would have immediately applied it to the records of Christianity? Yet these came late in the list: for many works of the classical authors of Greece were already multiplied in their own language by means of the press, and circulated in Europe, without any one as yet venturing to publish the books of the Christian Testament in their original tongue, although several impressions of the Latin Bible, and even of the German, existed.

Was it the veneration which was felt for them? the diffidence with which each measured his ability, in editing them? Or since the Florentine Synod, did they not fully confide in the Greeks and their MSS.? It hardly arose from want of religious liberty, which the Councils of Constance and Basil had but lately taken under their protection against the deplorable usurpations on the other side of the Alps.

At least, this was not the case in a free state, which was not inclined to endure coercion from without: I allude to Venice, where the celebrated Aldus first, in the year 1504, edited[p], not a New Testament, but

[p] Adler in Repert. for Bibl. and East. Lib. xviii. P. § 150.

merely, as a trial, the six first chapters of the Gospels of John, at which, contrary to expectation, it for a long time stopped. Probably, none of the New Testament previously existed but Mary's hymn of praise, Luke i. 42-56., and that of Zachariah, Luke i. 6-80., which are annexed to a beautiful Greek Psalter of the year 1486, which I possess.

SECTION LV.

Now, however, two individuals concurred in the undertaking, one of whom excelled all in learning and critical acumen; the other all in good will and perseverance, neither wanting the spirit nor the means of expenditure; and these were, Desiderius Erasmus, and the Spanish Minister Cardinal Ximenes.

In the midst of the festivities with which the Court celebrated the arrival of the heir to the throne (1502), the Minister formed the plan of his Polyglott Bible (Biblia Complutensia, *the Bible of Alcalà*), he summoned the scholars, to whom he was willing to entrust its execution, and afterwards laboured himself upon it in the midst of the most important affairs of state [q].

It was on the New Testament that they commenced, since according to the subscription after the Apocalypse that was completed in January, 1514, for the whole was not finished until the 10th of July in 1517.

For this purpose they used, as they state in the preface, the oldest and most correct MSS., which Leo X. sent to them from the Apostolical Library. As Leo was raised to the papal chair in March, 1513,

[q] Hist. du Card. Ximenes par Flechier, T. i. l. i. l'an 1502. Hist. du Ministere du Card. Ximenes par Marsolier. T. ii. l. iv.

they could, even if we do not take into the account the time necessary to the transmission of these MSS., have made but very little use of them in the ten months preceding the impression of the Apocalypse in January, 1514. Therefore, they must have obtained these MSS. much earlier, under Julius II., through the good offices of Cardinal de Medicis, who had considerable influence over this Pope, and they were now indebted to him for this favour in that dignity, in which he succeeded Julius.

They had also other MSS., of which they have not expressly made mention: Stunica at least appeals often, in his controversies with Erasmus, to a *Codex Rhodiensis*, which probably was sold, among others of the University Library at Alcalà, to the rocket-makers [r].

Ximenes had indeed the satisfaction of seeing his work finished, but he died four months afterwards, on the 8th of November, 1517, before it was published. Several years expired after his decease, until at last Leo X., on the 20th of March, 1525, granted permission for its publication.

Though Erasmus had begun late, yet he anticipated the New Testament of Alcalà by his own, which appeared in 1516, in fol. apud Frobenium, at Basil, accompanied with a Latin version of his own at the side, and excellent remarks.

The basis of his edition with respect to the Gospels, was the *Cod. Basil* B. vi. 25.—in the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles *Cod. Bas.* ix., both of which, with corrections from the hand of Erasmus, are preserved in the city Library of Basil: the *Codex Reuchlini*, from which he had the Apocalypse, is no longer to be found. With it he occasionally collated *Cod.*

[r] Michaelis's Intr. to the N. T. P. i. § 106. p. 776. 4th ed.

Basil. vi. 17., and *Basil.* B. x. 20., as well as Latin MSS., and some of the Fathers, as he says in the preface to the notes (p. 225), "Postremò ad probatissimorum omnium Suffragiis Auctorum, vel citationem, vel emendationem, vel enarrationem, nempe Origenis, Chrysostomi, Cyrilli, Hieronymi, Ambrosii, Hilarii, Augustini, quorum testimonia complusculis locis in hoc adduximus."

It appears that the annotations were made during the recension of the text, whence the preface to them is dated in 1515, earlier than the impression of the whole.

This edition of this astonishing man was soon followed by a second in 1519, and by a third in 1522, in which he first admitted[s], as he says, the passage in 1 John v. 7. *è Codice Britannico.* A fourth succeeded to them in 1527, and a fifth in 1535. In the two last the Bible of Alcalà was serviceable to him, from which he adopted several amendments, particularly in the Apocalypse.

SECTION LVI.

THE commencement being made, several others soon followed; among which was that of Andrew Asulanus, the father-in-law of Aldus, who, in 1518,

[s] This is well known to be *Cod. Montfortii*, written in some part of the fourteenth century. Cf. opera Erasmi, Tom. ix. p. 294. 295. Bas. 1540. and Repertor. for Bib. and East. Lit. iii. Pt. p. 260. Dr. Herbert Marsh has collated the passage from *Cod. Montf.* ἐν τῳ οὐρανῳ, πατηρ, λογος, και Πνευμα ἁγιον, και αὐτοι οἱ τρεις ἐν εἰσι. Και τρεις εἰσι οἱ μαρτυρουντες ἐν τῃ γῃ, with the Complutensian edition, which thus reads it, ἐν τῳ οὐρανῳ, ὁ πατηρ, και ὁ λογος, και το ἁγιον Πνευμα, και οἱ τρεις εἰς το ἓν εἰσι. Και τρεις εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυρουντες ἐπι της γης. Remarks and additions to Michaelis, p. 337. 338. Cf. in Paulus's Memorabilia, Pt. vi. § 14. 31.

printed at Venice, in folio, Erasmus's text, yet not without the collation of other MSS., unless what he says in the preface, "*multis vetustissimis exemplaribus collatis*," be an exaggeration. Yet, traces of them may at least be seen in some alterations, principally in the Apocalypse, and one of the MSS., which he used, containing all the New Testament but the Apocalypse, has recently been discovered by a scholar [t].

As *he* had Erasmus for his guide, so did Robert Stephanus follow the Bible of Alcalà in his neat edition, of 1546. in 16^mo^—which is called *Mirificam*. The word is an allusion to the beginning of the preface, "O mirificam regis nostri . . . liberalitatem!" whence the assertion arose, that it was free from all errors of the press. He made use of several MSS. in it, concerning which he says, with French vivacity: "siquidem codices nacti aliquot ipsâ vetustatis specie pene adorandos, quorum copiam nobis Bibliotheca regia facilè suppeditavit:" then he adds, "adjuti præterea sumus cum aliis, tum verò Complutensi editione, quam ad vetustissimos Bibliothecæ Leonis X. Pont. codices excudi jusserat Hispaniarum Cardinalis Franciscus Simenius, *quos cum nostris miro consensu sæpissimè convenire ex ipsâ collatione deprehendimus*."

This agreement indeed must have been very great between his MSS. and the text of Alcalà, since not only in this, but also in the following edition in 1549, in 16^mo^, he has reprinted it, as far as certain passages, as it is clear from the collation. Bengel. Introd. in Crit. N. T. § 36. p. 435.

But, in the third, which was printed in the year 1550, in folio, with a peculiar typographical beauty, and which is his chief edition, he follows (Bengel.

[t] Birch Præf. in iv. Evangel. Hauniæ. 1788. p. vii. viii. It is *Vatic.* 360.

l. c.) the fifth edition of Erasmus, with which he collated sixteen MSS., whose variations he exhibits in the margin. "Cum vetustissimis sedecim scriptis exemplaribus," he says in the preface: the first of them however is, as he himself declares, the Complutensian exemplar: the second was from Italy, the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, and 15th, from the Bibliotheque du Roi, the others from other places, all of which he cites, in serie, in the margin, under the marks α, β, γ, as far as ις[u]. In the year 1551, an edition of the New

[u] The learned have made it an object of great attention to discover the MSS. which Stephanus used in the third edition. The cause of which was 1 John v. 7., where Robert placed the mark of omission before ἐν τῳ οὐρανῳ, without remarking that it extends to the following words, as far as ἐν τῃ γῃ. Besides, he remarked in the margin of δ'. ε'. ζ'. ι'. ια'. ιγ'. that these are the MSS. which omit that, which he has marked, whence it has been concluded, that they have not the whole passage, but only the words, ἐν τῳ οὐρανῳ; or if even they omit the whole passage, that at least the other ten contain it. David Martin, Vérité du texte, 1 Jean v. 7. démontrée paar des preuves, qui sont au-dessus de toute exception. Utrecht. 1722. 8. Journal des Savans. Juin, 1720. p. 643.

Le Long and Wetstein commenced a search after them, and found a part of these MSS.—Griesbach corrected their testimonies, and Fleischer, in his letters to Michaelis, of which the latter has given extracts in his Introduction (in the third and fourth edition), has named the numbers, which they afterwards received in the Bibliotheque du Roi, at Paris.

α'. is according to Roberts's own testimony, the Edit. Complut.—β'. is Cantabrig. Ev. D.—γ'. Evang. Reg. 2867. now, according to Fleischer, 84. Griesbach doubts (Proleg. in N. T. edit. 2d § i. p. xix) the correctness of their assertion: he and Wetstein quote its readings N. 4. Evang.—δ'. Reg. 2871. Fleischer 106. contains the whole N. T. except the Apocalypse:—it is in Griesbach and Wetstein, in every class, N. 5.—ε'. Reg. 3425. Fleischer 112. is the whole N. T. except the Apocalypse: in Wetstein and Griesbach, every where, N. 6.—ς'. Reg. 2866. Fleischer 71. (the Gospels) is in Wetstein and Griesbach N. 7.—ζ'. is a Codex, for which Wetstein quotes two MSS. Reg. 2242. Gospels, and 2241. Paul, Acts, and

Testament appeared with the olive of Stephanus, in 8vo., without the place where it was printed, although it is thought at Geneva, accompanied by the Vulgate and Erasmus's version, which at first contained the division into verses made by Robert Novum Testamentum ad vetustissima exemplaria MSC. excusum: adjectâ duplici translatione, in interiore quidem margine veteris Interpretis, in interiore Desiderii Erasmi.... Quod autem per quosdam,

Catholic Epistles. The Gospels and Paul are in Wetstein marked N. 8., the Acts and Catholic Epistles, N. 50. But the last number, 2241. contains in Fleischer not merely the Acts, Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, but the whole New Testament, and is now N. 47.; yet it seems once to have had N. 2242. probably from some error of the pen. But in the Bibliotheque du Roi Gospels were still in existence, marked n. 2242., now n. 49. But 2241. n. 47. came long after Stephanus, (not until the year 1687.) into the Bibliotheque du Roi: hence Griesbach conjectures, that 2242. n. 49. might once have had the Acts and Catholic Epistles, which, however, were joined to it from another quarter. Proleg. in N. T. ed. 2. § 1. p. xxi.—η′ is certainly Evang. Reg. 2861. now, 63. or L.—θ′. *Coisl.* 200., the New Testament, except the Apocalypse, in Wetstein and Griesbach, Evang. n. 38. Paul, 23. Acts and Catholic Epistles 19.—ι′ Reg. 2870. Fleischer 102. in Wetstein and Griesbach, Paul 9., Acts and Catholic Epistles 7.—ια′. Acts and Catholic Epistles, n. 8. Paul 10., in Wetstein and Griesbach:—we know not what was extracted from it.—ιβ′. Reg. 2862. Evang. according to Fleischer, now 83. But Griesbach does not account these arrangements perfectly certain. The readings occur in him and Wetstein, under n. 9. Evang.—ιγ′. is according to Marsh's latest edition, *Cantabrig.* kk. 6. 4. *Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, in Vindication of one of the Translator's Notes to Michaelis's Introduction. By the Translator of Michaelis,* Leips. 1795. 8vo. p. 49-70.—ιδ′ Evang. not Reg. 2865., but Victorian 774 in the Library at St. Victor in Paris. *Griesbach Symb. critic.* P. 1. p. cxliv—xlvi. in Griesbach Evang. n. 120.—ιε′. Reg. 2869. according to Fleischer 237. contains the Epistles of Paul, Acts, Catholic Epistles, and Apocalypse. It was *de novo* collated by Wetstein: in whom it is in Paul n. 12., in the Acts and Catholic Epistles n. 10., in the Apocalypse n. 2., as well as in Griesbach.—ις′ is, as Griesbach says, *ignotus Codex Apocalypseos.* Its readings occur in him and in Wetstein, under n. 3. Apocalypse.

ut vocant, versiculos, (the preface adds) opus distinximus, id vetustissima exemplaria ... secuti fecimus. It is really true, that old MSS. are found, which are sometimes divided into similar smaller sentences, which have some analogy to our verses.

In the year 1569, another appeared from his son Robert: Lutetiæ ex officinâ Rob. Stephani Typographi Regii, typis regiis MDLXIX. 16. *In calce,* are appended select various readings, with the title, selectæ variantes ex Stephani tertiâ.

All these editions in their days had an inestimable value, although really they are nothing but defective attempts, as all new undertakings in a new department must be. Formerly, any transcriber copied an ancient Codex, sometimes having a choice of MSS. oftener from chance, and brought this and that MS. into collation, for the sake of consulting it in illegible or doubtful passages, or for the sake of choosing here and there according to his approbation, a reading which was more intelligible to him. So was the case here; the editors seized the nearest and best MSS. which were in the neighbourhood, without having the least perception of the critical apparatus, which lay dormant in the darkness of their libraries, of the different critical singularities which occur in the New Testament, or of the principles on which they ought here to proceed. And however superior they were in learning to former transcribers, still they every where made their emendations at random, like them, according to opinion and casual views, and in this respect were even behind the Greek Librarii, since they had less information respecting the age of the MSS. and their criteria.

In the present day, even these editions would be far more important to us, if each of the editors had printed any ancient MS. only faithfully and

carefully, without giving scope to his own judgment: if, for example, the Complutensians had faithfully given to us merely the Rhodian Codex, as Hearne the Laudian of the Acts, or Woide the Alexandrine, with a preliminary description of its appearance and state.

They, therefore, properly belong to the history of the study of the Bible, to the typography and cultivation of the tenth century, and may, in different points of view, give all sorts of explanations; but they are only so far serviceable to the criticism of the New Testament, as they enable us to retrace the errors and false readings which are in our printed editions, to their source.

SECTION LVII.

Now a host of book-dealers arose, who at one time reprinted one, at another, another of these four editions, or compiled a new one from two or three of them.

Christopher Plantin five times reprinted at Antwerp the edition of Alcalà, in the years 1564, 1573, 1574, 1590, 1591, and his press, after his death, issued it in 1601, 1612. At Geneva re-impressions of it appeared in the years 1609, 1619, 1620, 1628, 1632[x]. It was also repeated in the Parisian Polyglott in the 9th and 10th parts, 1645. Lastly, it was printed likewise at Mentz, in the year 1753, where Fr. Goldhagen placed under it various readings, among which were even some from the uncollated *Codex Molsheimensis*.

The editions of Erasmus were reprinted by Wol-

[x] Le Long, Biblioth. Sacr. ed. Masch. P. i. p. 281—93.

fius Cephalæus, Argentorarii, 1524, 8vo. by Froben and Episcopius, 1545, 4to. ἐτυπώθη ἐν βασιλείᾳ παρ' Ἱερωνυμῳ Φροβηνιῳ, και Νικολαῳ Ἐπισκοπιῳ, ἐτει της Θεογονιας αφμε', also by Heerwagen, Basil 1545, fol.[y] by Nicholas Brylinger Gr. Lat. Basil 1546, and 1550, 8vo. by Vœgelin, Græc. Lat.—Lipsiæ imprimebatur per Andream Schneider, Typis Vœgelianis, 1570, and by Leonhard Osten, Gr. Lat. Basil. 1583, 8vo.

Two of the re-impressions of Erasmus are particularly to be distinguished, since it were unjust to mix them with the common mass. The first is that of Simon Colinæus, whose New Testament (Paris, 1534), recognizes that of Erasmus, as its basis, but is not without its own merit. The editor himself consulted ancient MSS., among which was *Victorianus* 774, which afterwards Stephanus called ιδ', (in Griesbach 120 of the Gospels) or a MS. very nearly allied to this Codex, viz. 2865[b], in Griesbach 119. In the Acts of the Apostles, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, he collated a MS., which Stephanus afterwards marked ια'[z]. From these and other exemplaria, it seems he altered the text of Erasmus, and improved it, as he designed, in many places. This edition was earlier than the first of Stephanus, and by means of his laudable effort might have rendered its credit doubtful, had the public opinion favoured it. But it had no imitators and reprinters, and therefore remained among the secondary editions.

The other is Jacob Bogard, who, in the year 1543, followed (with some alterations, principally in the Apocalypse,) that of Erasmus, and added to his New Testament an appendix from Stephanus's ιδ'[a].

[y] Millius, Proleg. n. 1153.

[z] Bengel. Introd. in Cris. T. N. § 36. p. 435. Griesbach, Symb. Crit. P. i. p. cxlvi—cliv.

[a] Wetstein Proleg. p. 142.

From the Bible of Alcalà, with a consultation of Erasmus, sprang Biblia Antwerpiana Regis 1571-72 [b], Plantin's editions, 1572, and afterwards 1584, fol. with the interlineary version of Arias Montanus [c], Raphelius's edition at Leyden, 1591, 16mo.; and that also of Comelin, with the same interlineary version, 1599, in great folio.

From those of Erasmus and Aldus, the Hagenau editions *in ædibus Thomæ Anselmi Badensis*, 1521, *Mense Martis*, were compiled; the Strasburg apud Fabricius Capito, 1524; the editions of John Bebel, with the preface of Œcolampadius at Basil, 1530 and 1535, 8vo., and those of Thomas Plater 1538, 1540, 1543, and 1544 [d], in Basil, in 8vo.

Της καινης διαθηκης απαντα, Novum Testam. Parisiis, impensis viduæ Birkmanni, 1549, 16mo. is said to be a re-impression of the first edition of Stephanus;—one, described in Le Long, ed. Masch. P. i. p. 215., is said to agree perfectly with this, as to appearance, only that instead of Birkman, the name of Haultin stands on the title-page [e].

Wechel's heirs faithfully reprinted the third edition of Stephanus, 1601, fol. together with the

[b] Bengel. Intr. in Cris. N. T. p. 453, § 36. cf. Wets. Prol. p. 150.

[c] Curcellæus Præf. in Nov. T. Wets. Prol. p. 151.

[d] Masch. Le Long, Bib. Sacr. P. i. p. 200, doubted the existence of the edition of MDXLIII. It is, by the side of the other editions of Plater, in the Academical Library of Hessia, and is exactly like the third, even to the comma, XLIII. and XLIV. The title, the dedication, *Docto et Pio M. Severino Ertzberger Basileensis Ecclesiæ communi Diacono, Joannes Gastius Brisacensis Theologiæ Candidatus S. D.*; also the preface, *in sacrarum litterarum lectionem Johannis Œcolampadii exhortatio*, the text, the number of pages, and subscription, are the same. It is also dated, like that of XLIII. in March, *Basileæ per Thomam Platerum, impensis Reinhardi Beck. A.* MDXLIII. *Mense Martio.*

[e] Marsh's Remarks on Michaelis's Introduction, P. i. p. 426. German translation.

various readings in the margin. They had, indeed, much earlier conjointly made an impression of the third and fifth editions of Stephanus, viz. in the year 1597, fol. in which they placed the various readings on the side margin of the third edition of Stephanus, under the text, and added readings from the Bible of Alcalà and the Vulgate. "Ad Novum Testamentum quod attinet (says the preface) exemplar Roberti Stephani Typographi Regii, patris et filii, secuti sumus, atque varias lectiones, quæ non tantum in eo exemplari ex codicibus regiis collectæ continebantur, sed et in Complutensi et in aliis editionibus, et quorundam adnotationibus reperiri potuerunt, adjici curavimus." These, and particularly Aldus's editions, are the component parts of the *Margo Wecheliorum*, on which Francis Junius is said to have been employed, and which formerly was in great repute.

Likewise, N. I. C. Testamentum Græcè collatis non paucis venerandæ fidei exemplaribus, accuratissimâ cum limâ editum per Nicol. Bryling. MDLXIII. 8vo. followed Stephanus. The side-margin, like the third of Stephanus, is inscribed with various readings, which are really selected judiciously from it: yet, the marks of the MSS. are wanting with which Stephanus quoted them. Also, in the midst of them other various readings are noticed, which do not appear there, as, *e. g.* Matt. ii. 2. προσκυνησαι αὐτον. v. 11. εἰπωσι παν πονηρον καθ' ὑμων. vi. 34. μεριμνησει ἑαυτης. ix. 4. και εἰδως ὁ Ἰησους. xv. 39. ἀνεβη. xvii. 25. τα τελη. xix. 24. εἰς την βασιλειαν των οὐρανων εἰσελθειν. xxi. 30. ναι, Κυριε, ... ἐγω ὑπαγω. xxv. 22. ἐκερδησα ἐν αὐτοις. These I have remarked in Matthew; but I have generally again met them in Aldus, and the others seem to have been taken from the Vulgate. With these, Crispin's and Vœgel's editions, A. 1564., are enumerated, which I do not know.

Vœgel's edition at Leipsic 1564., says John David Michaelis, and Crispin's at Geneva 1553, entirely follow Stephanus.

SECTION LVIII.

Since the time of Stephanus, Biblical criticism had obtained no accession, by means of all these piratical printers; for no one of them contributed any one thing from uncollated MSS. to the fair collection, which the former caused his son to prepare. Just as little did any one of them attempt felicitously to apply the apparatus, which lay before him, to a critical edition. Even Stephanus distrusted himself to do such a task; but only printed the 5th of Erasmus with some alterations, scattering however the various readings in the margin for that one among his purchasers, who, at a future time, might desire to make use of them.

This was Theodore Beza, a pupil of John Calvin, who appropriated the Scriptural collations, for which Robert was indebted to his son Henry, and obtained, I know not whence, an Arabic and a Syriac version, which after a time appeared through the laudable assiduity of Widmanstad. He begins by criticising the text, and amending the preceding editions, particularly that of Erasmus. Beza had the lot to be often much praised, and often much censured; both with equal reason. His emendations are frequently sensible; but the means for such an undertaking were too defective, and there was as yet no critical principle to direct the use of them.

His first edition appeared without the place where it was printed (at Geneva) at the press of Henry Stephanus: Jesû Christi D. N. Novum Testamentum, &c. &c. Anno MDLXV. excudebat Henricus Stephanus

illustris viri Huldrici Fuggeri typographus. The Greek text has two Latin versions, the Vulgate and his own on the side, and annotations below, which are sometimes critical, sometimes exegetical. The dedication is to Elizabeth, Queen of England, in which he announces, that he had used 25 MSS. Ad hæc omnia accessit ex Stephani nostri Bibli. othecâ cum *viginti quinque* plus minùs manuscriptis Codicibus, et omnibus benè impressis ab Henrico Stephano, ejus filio, et paternæ sedulitatis hærede quam diligentissimè collatum. A second edition of it by the same printer followed in the year 1576; then a third, a fourth and a fifth, 1582, 1589, 1598. In the second he only names *septemdecim MSti*. but in the fourth and fifth *novemdecim*. Having in the first referred to 25 MSS., which are reduced in the second to 17, he has thereby drawn on himself the bitter censure even of his own friends.

Yet, I do not conceive him so inconsiderate, supposing him to have made some exaggeration in the first edition, as to have forgotten and afterwards disgraced himself in the second. It seems to me probable, which indeed has been alleged in his exculpation, that in the first edition he wrote xv. which the compositor imagined xxv., and set *viginti quinque* in full characters, for there are 15 on the margin of Stephanus, if we do not reckon the Complutensian edition. If we reckon *this also*, as Stephanus did, and the *Codex Claromontanus* besides, we have his *septemdecim*. Afterwards, he obtained an *antiquissimus Codex* MST., of which he speaks in the two last editions, hence the number amounted to 18. But there were only nineteen, even if he twice (among those of Stephanus and his own) reckoned the *Codex Cantabrigiensis*, which in the mean time had become his property,

This individual gave another form to the text, than it had heretofore, and he was the proper author of the *textus receptus*. His learning and the particular recommendation, of having been Calvin's pupil, procured for him regard in this school, and his recension was honored in England [f], but especially in Holland and Switzerland.

Among the scholars of the Lutheran persuasion no one had in the mean time particularly distinguished himself: the insipid controversies with the Papists employed too many hands, and withdrew them from the cultivation of another sort of literature. To which we may add, that the book trade was fixed to Holland. The Elzevirs principally turned this circumstance to their own advantage, and circulated, without mentioning a syllable of the author, this recension, in several neat and beautiful editions, in every country and among every sect.

The first Elzevir edition appeared without preface or postscript. Lugduni Bat. ex officinâ Elzevirianâ, Anno MDCXXIV. 16mo. On the title-page alone, it is observed, ex regiis aliisque optimis editionibus cum curâ expressum.

The basis is certainly the text of Robert Stephanus's third edition: for, this was also the basis of Beza, and those scholars are right, who have remarked a great agreement between it and the third edition of Stephanus [g]. But wherever they depart from Robert, they follow Beza. Wetstein has noticed several passages, in which the text differs from him, and gives instead the corrections of Beza. Proleg. p. 151-52. Mill has also observed similar variations,

[f] I know among the English impressions of Beza only one, An. 1642. Cantabrig. fol.

[g] Le Long, Bib. Sacr. Ed. Masch. P. i. p. 226.

Prol. p. 1307., which, if he had collated Beza, he would for the most part have again found in him. Of some Birch [h] has given a list as a supplement, from the Gospels, and then from the other books of the New Testament, among which are some which do not vary from the preceding, as Mark vi. 9., Luke xv. 26., John viii. 25., xiii. 30., xviii. 24., but several, which were first noticed by him, I have again found in Beza: such as Matt. xxi. 7., Mark viii. 3., Luke vii. 12., x. 19., and the most remarkable of all, xvii. 36.—also, xviii. 3., John vi. 28., ix. 20., xiv. 9., xviii. 20., xix. 30. This fact is thus sufficiently established, which I am aware first struck L' Abbè Bengel.

The second edition, ἡ καινη διαθηκη. Novum Testamentum. Ex regiis, aliisque optimis Editionibus, hâc novâ expressum, cui quid accesserit Præfatio docebit. Lugd. Bat. ex officinâ Elzeviriorum, ciɔiɔcxxxiii. 12mo. has indeed the temerity to announce itself in the preface, as the *textus receptus*: "*textum* ergo habes ab omnibus *receptum*, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus." As long as they believed this asseveration, it became really so. Shortly afterwards, several editions followed it from this infallible press, in the years 1641—1656—1662, so that it sent in five impressions at least eight thousand copies into the world.

But Stephen Curcellæus devised a plan to give again the charm of novelty to these editions, by selecting from Wechel's margin, some printed books, and one MS. or another, various readings, which he added as an appendix to the edition of 1658. apud

[h] Birch, Præf. ad iv. Evang. p. iv. Præf. ad Var. Lect. Actor. Epist. Pauli et Cathol. Hauniæ. 1798. Præf. ad Var. Lect. in text. Apocalyps. Hauniæ. 1800.

Danielem Elzevirium, and in the edition of 1675. at length inserted into the text, without otherwise altering any one thing in it; quæ ad præcedentes Elzevirianas expressa fuit, nulla prorsùs in textû factâ mutatione.

This modification of the text had been so profitable to the Elzevirs, that notwithstanding the repeated impressions, others also perceived their advantage in it, as for instance, Blaw, who reprinted the second edition of Curcellæus in the same year: Amstelodami ex officinâ Blavianâ, MDCLXXV. Sumpt. Societ. Long before, he had shewn the same complaisance to the Elzevirs, and had reprinted their text of 1633. Amstelodami apud Guil. Blaw. 1633. 12mo.

But that nothing on any side might be wanting, to give universal reception to this text, the orthodox Father Morinus took pains to circulate it in a splendid impression (Paris 1628) among the French Clergy.

Besides, the booksellers Wetstein and Smith speculated with it for the benefit of those [1], who could not well proceed without a Latin translation. They caused therefore the version of Arias Montanus to be printed at the side, and Leusden was obliged to superintend the edition, for the sake of recommending it by his name. Thus, the Elzevir text appeared *de novo*, Amstelodami ex officinâ Wetsteniânâ, 1698, and was very often reprinted in this shape, under this title, and also *apud Wetsten. et G. Smith.*

But for the sake of taking into consideration the more learned order of society they contrived to in-

[1] *Jener armen Sünder* :—not being provided with a copy of this edition, I am uncertain, whether by this term Hug means *convicts under sentence of death*, or simply "those poor sinners."—TRANSL.

troduce into it the collation of a Vienna-MS. (Lambec. 28.) which Gerhard of Mastricht had undertaken, as well as the critical principles, which this scholar had sketched in his hours of leisure. Enriched with this new dowry, the Curcellæan edition appeared Amstel. ex officinâ Wetsteniană, 1711, and a second time, Amstelod. apud J. Wetsten. et G. Smith, 1735, 8vo. The text itself remained unaltered, except (as they congratulate themselves) by being printed free from errors: "textum emendavi (says the preface) ad editionem tertiam Elzevirianam Anni 1633, à Cl. Leusdeno mendis repurgatam." The letters, with which the author has expressed the critical rules (xliii. *canones critici.*) on the title-page, *e. g.* G. D. T. M. D. signify Gerhardus de Trajectû Mosæ Doctor.

Whilst the stream of the *textus receptus* rolled on, and bore away every thing with it, Bœcler, as it seems, wished them to notice, that it frequently returned to the text of Robert Stephanus. He gave two editions of it: ἡ καινη διαθηκη. Accessit Prologus in Epistolas S. Apostoli Pauli ex antiquissimo MSC. Argent. ex officinâ Stædelii, A. ɔɔɔɔɔɔxlv, and lx. in 12mo. Yet it appears, that the first was merely provided with a new title-page, and then sold as a second edition. He says in the preface: "Collatis etiam MSC. membranis, de quibus ad calcem libri:" this MS., as he describes it at the end, contained the Acts, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, with the Prologus of Euthalius on Paul's Epistles, which he has printed in the Appendix. But Bœcler has not applied the MS. (as Bengel has already remarked) to the arrangement of the text, of which I have convinced myself. It is well known, that his MS. went to Rome, where Zacagni made use of it in the edition of Euthalius. But he solely confined

himself to the *textus receptus*, in which here and there he made alterations according to the third of Stephanus. In the following passages he reverts to Stephanus, Acts xvi. 17., Rom. xii. 11., 1 Cor. xv. 23., 2 Cor. v. 4., xi. 1., Phil. i. 23., Apoc. iii. 12., iv. 10., v. 9., viii. 5., xi. 1, 2., xiii. 3. 5., xix. 1. 6., xx. 4., xxi. 16.

SECTION LIX.

In the interim, whilst the Hollanders exercised their ignorance, as fancy led them, in another country the text passed over to the hands of scholars from Traffickers and their assistants. This excellent fate happened to it in England. Walton and other well-informed men were engaged together in a great work, in editing the London Polyglott, which was to contain the Syriac, Arabic, Æthiopic and Persic versions of the New Testament, all valuable materials for criticism.

The Greek text was treated with much greater care, than might be expected in a work of so extensive a plan. The Dutch distortions of the *textus receptus* had no influence over Walton and his associates. He took the third of Stephanus, as the basis, and placed under it the readings of the celebrated Alexandrine Codex A. Thus appeared the New Testament, Londini, MDCLVII. in the 5th part of the Polyglott.

But the 6th part was peculiarly devoted to bring to light a *copia* of readings, from Greek MSS., which had not been, for the most part, collated. Mill (Proleg. N. 1372.) enumerates them in sixteen numbers, to which, for the sake of making each part known, we add the marks of Wetstein and Gries-

bach, N. 1. Cantabr. D—ii. Ep. Paul. D., iii. Evang. 59., iv. Ep. Paul 30., v. Evang. 64., vi. Evang. 62., vii. Evang. 61., Paul. 40., Act. et Ep. Cath. 34., viii. Evang. 56., ix. Ep. Paul. 39., Act. et Ep. Cath. 33., x. Evang. 57., Paul. 41., Act. et Ep. Cath. 35., xi. Ep. Paul. 43., xii. Evang. 58., xiii. Act. Ep. Cath. 36., xiv. Act. Ep. Cath. 37., xv. Evang. 47., xvi. Evang. Joaun. 96. Lastly the Velezian readings were here inserted [k].

As to other points, the editors were satisfied, without further entering into criticism, with the merit of having opened in this valuable work their treasures to the learned world.

The numerous variations of MSS., which by means of this work, have again become known, nevertheless disturbed many minds, and in particular, as it seems, that of the Rev. Dr. John Fell, afterwards Bishop of Oxford. He entered deeply into this research, collated several MSS., and edited a New Testament with a preface, in which his object is to pacify his readers respecting this apprehension. It appeared under the title, της καινης διαθηκης απαντα. Novi Testamenti libri omnes. Accesserunt parallela Scripturæ loca, necnon variantes Lectiones ex plus 100 MSS. codicibus, et antiquis versionibus collectæ, è Theatro Sheldoniano, Anno Dom. MDCCXXV., 8vo.

As he says in his preface, Curcellæus was his basis, in whom he partly discovered the readings of Stephanus and the Wechels, with which he united the

[k] They have this name from Peter Faxard Marquis of Velez, who is said to have collected them from 16 Greek MSS.; but it is now decided, that they were borrowed from the Vulgate and translated into Greek. La Cerda first published them in *Adversariis Sacris*. Lugd. 1626. *fol.* Herbert Marsh has the most clearly shewn this fraud in the Appendix to his learned remarks on Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, Pt. I.

collections in the London Polyglott. He however introduced the collation of 12 hitherto unexamined MSS. in the Bodleian Library; he obtained the collation of two MSS. from the Library in Dublin, of four more from France, and the readings of the Coptic and Gothic version from Thomas Marshall. To these he yet added the various readings which Caryophilus had compiled from 22 Roman MSS [1].

After all, it might appear doubtful as to the hundred MSS., of which he boasts in the title-page, since the Velezian cannot be reckoned, and those of the Wechels and Stephanus do not differ.

This Prelate acquired a still greater merit in instigating Mill to the work of the New Testament, in inspiring him with continued perseverance and courage, and imparting his own energetic aid, in exerting himself to eclipse his own labour, and to be excelled by another, so that literature might gain by it. Mill speaking in his Prolegomena of the decease of this illustrious individual, relates with feeling and emotion, what a noble patron he had in him, and how much assistance he lost in him.

Mill not merely compiled various readings, writing them by the side or under the text of Stephanus (for he took the third edition as his basis) without saying from which MSS. they are, where they were preserved, and what peculiarities they

1 John Matthew Caryophilus, a Cretan, compiled these readings by command of Urban VIII., for the sake of applying them to a Greek edition of the New Testament. This was not executed, and Possinus afterwards edited them *in Catenâ in Evang.* Marci *Romæ* 1673. *fol.* These readings were formerly accounted twin-brothers of the Velesian: but, Birch discovered some MSS., on which Caryophilus laboured, and has thus saved his credit. Proleg. ad iv. Evang. Hauniæ. 1788, p. xxxvi—xliv. et Proleg. in Var. Lect. Act. et Epist. p. ix. Hauniæ. 1798., 8vo.

had, but he shewed the abode of these documents, sometimes with the numbers, which they bore in the Libraries, and designated each in his edition by a mark of its own, under which he quoted its individual readings, for the sake of explaining to the readers whence each of them was taken. After this, he detailed, wherever and as far as it was possible, the age and peculiarities of each MS., the accuracy with which it was written, the deficiencies which are peculiar to it. He collated them not merely here and there, and in isolated passages, but he generally made a continued collation from the beginning to the end of them.

Thus, his undertaking was essentially distinguished from the preceding labours, and it led the world to a detailed knowledge of the text, its various state in various documents, and the numerous critical helps, from which a more genuine representation of it might hereafter proceed.

He himself singularly felt the use of this mode of proceeding: he no longer dared, like his predecessors, to go to work blindly and at random. He could pronounce from the original materials, the age, and the goodness of MSS. concerning their admissibility, and the weight of their testimony, or now he was able to decide from the majority of voices, after having examined so considerable a number of them.

Besides, he had acquired from his great acquaintance with MSS. an empiric quickness in detecting additions, interpolations, and suspicious alterations, which his judgment often felicitously guided.

He now again examined the greater part of those MSS. which Walton had collated in the English Polyglott, which we have before enumerated, as well as several of those, from which Bishop Fell made excerpta. Then he collated, Ev. 50,, Ev. 51.,

Paul 38., Acts, Cath. Ep. 32., Ev. 52, 53, 54, 55., Ev. 60., Apoc. 10., Ev. 65, 66, 67, 68., Ev. 69., Paul 37., Acts, Cath. Ep. 31., Apoc. 14., Ev. 70, 71—75. He also obtained from others collations of K, Cyprius, and Colbert, Ev. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33., and Ev. 91. In this manner did he scrutinize and extract from No. 45, (I have cited them after Wetstein's and Griesbach's numbers) as far as seventy,—most of the copies of the Gospels, or of the whole New Testament, which were in England, and from many foreign countries procured collations, by means of others.

In the Acts he collated E, or Laud, 3 in the Acts,—in the Epistles in general, and the Apocalypse, he collated the following, 26 Paul, 21 Acts, Cath. Ep., 28 Paul, 23 Acts, Cath. Ep., 6 Apoc., 31 Paul, 25 Acts, Cath. Ep., 7 Apoc., 32 Paul, 26 Acts, Cath. Ep., 33 Paul, 27 Acts, Cath. Ep., 34 Paul, 28 Acts, Cath. Ep., 8 Apoc., 36 Paul, 30 Acts, Cath. Ep., 47 Paul. From others he obtained E. Sangerm. Ep. Colb. 17 Paul, 35 Paul, 29 Acts, Cath. Ep., 44 Paul, 38 Acts, Cath. Ep., 45 Paul, 39 Acts, Cath. Ep., 11 Apoc. 46 Paul, 40 Acts, Cath. Ep., 12 Apoc. Among the Evangeliaria he collated, 3-4-5-18-19-20-21-22.

He still further referred to nearly all the ancient versions, and the citations of the Fathers of the Church, which he diligently collected.

This vast treasure, which this indefatigable scholar had brought together during a labour of thirty years, he published with excellent and well executed Prolegomena in the year 1707. Oxonii è Theatro Sheldoniano, fol.

Mill only survived a few days the completion of his extremely laborious and meritorious work, by which he made a new æra in criticism, and opened its fairer epoch.

Shortly afterwards, Ludolph Küster procured the

collation of some MSS. from Paris, which were C or Ephræm, M or des Champs. Evang. 9-10-11-12-13-14-15, according to Wetstein's numbers. From others he obtained Ev. 78. Griesbach—Paul 48, Acts, Cath. Ep. 42., Apoc. 13. The single MS. which he himself collated, is B. Ep. Pauli. or Bœrnerianus. With these he sought peculiarly to recommend the re-impression of Mill's work, which he superintended at Amsterdam, 1710, fol. This edition was again reprinted Lipsiæ, 1723, fol. Küster's merit in this edition is not great, but he is guilty of a great oversight, in not having carefully inserted Mill's Appendix.

SECTION LX.

The New Testament had now wandered through some countries with a various fate, before it returned to Germany, without any one of our nation having acquired a considerable merit in it.

Bengel is the first of the Germans, who laboured in this field with credit. He laboured indefatigably, during his ministerial duties, several years on the New Testament of Mill, and consulted occasionally both Latin and Greek MSS. Among these are Evang. 83-84-85, the two last of which only contain fragments of the Gospels, also Ev. 86. from Presburg. 97. (John,) and the Evangeliarium 24: then 54. (the Epistle of Paul to the Romans)—55. Paul, 46. Acts, Cath. Ep., 53. Paul, the monography of which is worthy of notice. Cod. Uffenbach. qui fragm. ad Hebræos continet, recensus, et specimen ære exsculptum (by D. Heuke) Helmstadii —1800. 52. Paul., Acts, Cathol. Ep. 45. Apoc. 16., and Augustanus, 7. Chartaceus, continens Apocalypsin (as he says) cum exegesi Andreæ Cæsareensis,

which Wetstein and Griesbach have forgotten to quote in their list. He obtained from others the collation of 87 Wetst. among the Matthæo-Moscow MSS. V. and hasty extracts from Basil. E, as well as from Ev. Bas. 1 and 2.

Yet herein his merit does not consist, he had collated just as much as was necessary to develop his critical talents. He was not indebted to those around him or to valuable materials: but his merit proceeded from himself and from his own genius.

By long study he comprehended the various singularities of the text, and was so acquainted with the peculiarities and style of the many critical documents, that from his observations he acquired new principles for his critical conduct.

He was the first to perceive, that in certain singular readings, this or that number of MSS. agree, and remain pretty much alike throughout; and of them he immediately distinguished two such families of MSS., one of which he called the African, the other occasionally the Asiatic. This remark led him to uniformity of critical conduct, as all the various testimonies might be easily retraced to some few voices: thus he actually arrived at rules, and gave to the then existing progress of criticism the first impulse, which will remain, if even his Bible should be forgotten.

His edition of the New Testament, which he published at Tübingen, at the press of Cotta, an. 1734, in 4to., at first gave no more than the text with select various readings in the lower margin: but an apparatus follows, the first section of which exhibits the laws of criticism, the second the grounds for the readings selected in particular places, and the third, which is the Epilogue, replies to some doubts, which might be opposed to his critical undertaking.

In the mean time, a younger and more active man, provided with more than ordinary knowledge and preparations, was on the point of passing by the Würtemberg Abbot on the road: this was John Jacob Wetstein of Basil. He had announced his New Testament in the year 1730, at Amsterdam by means of Prolegomena, of which Bengel had taken frequent notice; but the work itself first appeared at Amsterdam in two folio volumes, in 1751 and 1752.

That he had collected around him the whole apparatus of his predecessors, is self-evident: he often went back to the sources, saw the documents with his own eyes, examined and collated also some MSS. once more, of which Walton, Fell, and Mill, had already made use. But England was already too much gleaned; he directed his attention therefore to France, which offered to him new treasures. Moreover, his native city furnished him with some excellent old exemplaria, which were very far from being sufficiently known and used.

He described the MSS., named their abode with the numbers which they bore in their places: he did not indeed detail their style and peculiarities so accurately as Mill, but he carefully investigated their age, and determined it often with a more correct Palæographical survey than the other had done. Then to every one of these he gave in his edition its own mark, with which he quotes its readings.

Concerning that, which he added to preceding collations in England, or very hastily examined, we do not speak here, for it is the smallest part of his merit. A magnificent document opens the list of his new collated MSS. (for Küster's extracts are not to be brought in competition with it) viz. C. or 1905. now 9 among the Parisian MSS., which contains all the books of the New Testament, yet

with great defects, and from known causes is calculated to subject the eyes and the patience to a trial. Then comes E. in the Gospels, or *Basileens*, vi. 21. Of the more modern MSS. there follow in their order, according to his numbers—1 Basil. N. Test. without the Apocalypse.—2 Gospels.—Of the Coislinian MSS. 34. Gospels—35. Gospels—18 Paul —14 Acts, Cath. Ep. 17. Apoc. 36. Gos. 37. Gos. 38. Gos. 23. Paul. 19 Acts, Cath. Ep.—39. Gos. 40. Gos. 41. Gos. of Matthew and Mark, istos octo codices (he says) quâ potui diligentiâ consuli. He still further collated 72. Ev. before this book went to England; 89, in Griesbach 90.—a whole N. Test. with the exception of the Apocalypse; of which he has however only made use in the Gospels: 91. in Griesbach 92. the Gospel of Mark—93. in Griesbach 94. Mark and Luke. Also *Cod.* L., which beautiful MS., however, he but hastily consulted. He obtained from others 44 Gos. 73 Gos., in Griesb. 73 and 74.

The following Evangeliaria were recollated by him—1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17—purely Colbertine, and Scaligeri Græco-Arab, a Lectionary, in the Gospels—Paul, Acts, Cath. Ep. every where n. 6.

In Paul's Epistles, he twice collated D. or Claromont; then E. or Sangerman, and F., formerly Augiensis, a beautiful document. Also 2 Basil, Paul, Acts, Cath. Ep.—4 Basil, Paul, Acts, Cath. Ep.—7 Basil, Paul—16 Paul—11 Acts, Cath. Ep.—4 Apoc. Besides the before-named Coislinian MSS., he collated 19 Paul—16 Acts, Cath. Ep.—20 Paul—21 Paul—17 Acts, Cath. Ep. 19 Apoc.—22 Paul—18 Acts, Cath. Ep., 18 Apoc.—44 Paul—38 Acts, Cath. Ep. Of the uncollated English MSS., 25 Paul—26 Paul—21 Acts, Cath. Ep.—27 Paul. Of these Mill knew indeed 25, but he did not quote them in

his list. From others he obtained, Paul. G. and H. —Apoc. 26, 27, 28—and Apoc. B. Basilianor; of which last, however, he could make but little additional use. In the whole there are above forty Codices, which were for the first time or properly collated by him, without taking those collations into the account, which were communicated to him from other quarters. Besides, the ancient versions already known, he first brought forwards and made use of the Philoxenian.

The opinions concerning Wetstein's accuracy, as well as in general concerning his performance and creed, and even concerning his learning, were not uniform. He was probably, like all mortals, not always equally disposed and collected for such laborious and joyless occupations; but where it was worth his labour, as, *e. g.* in Codex C. or Ephræm; he has achieved even what was incredible, as we know from him[m], who followed his steps with attention and deep knowledge of the subject. Yet has he fallen into errors, although rather in those instances, where he made use of foreign materials, than where he examined and made extracts for himself.

But, in my opinion, he may be more justly censured for not having adopted and appreciated Bengel's beautiful critical ideas.

On the other hand, also, a peculiar merit of Wetstein is too commonly left in the dark. His rich collection of elucidatory passages from profane authors, Fathers of the Church, and Rabbinical writings, which he has inserted in his New Testament, attests a genius which often saw further than the ἐξηγηται of his day, and probably, than illustrious scholars after him. I do not here enter into the strongly dogma-

[m] Griesbach, Symb. cr. P. i. p. vi.

P. II. 1793; which, although they were published later, than his New Testament, might be considered as a preface to it. It appeared at Halle, in two 8vo. volumes the first in 1777, the second previously in 1775.

I am very accurately acquainted with this book, and have, as I could not always use Wetstein as I would, compared, when a young theologian, many a folio volume of the Fathers with it, for the sake of informing myself respecting the various singularities in the text, and its geographical references. What sometimes disturbed me is, that where two readings are cited, the one in the text, the other in the space between the text and the authorities, it cannot always be decided for which of the two readings the authorities enumerated below give evidence. Otherwise it was, as a manual, a perfect work for his day.

Yet it could not long continue in this estimation, since the diligence of learned men every where sought for critical documents, and brought them to light. Christian Fr. Matthæi, professor of Profane Theology in the University of Moscow, has endeavoured to render his residence in a place rich in MSS., as useful as possible, and has published many treasures of this description, which, without him, would have long lain in concealment, and probably never been introduced to notice with such accuracy.

Among a multitude of learned labours, by which classical literature and the knowledge of the Fathers have been advanced, he collated with indefatigable exertions the MSS. which are deposited in the Library of the Holy Synod, or preserved in other Libraries in Moscow [n]. In the preface to the Catholic

[n] After the Epist. ad Thess. p. 272, he gives an account de Bibliothecis et Codicibus N. T. Mosquensibus in genere.

Epistles, he mentions more than seventy MSS. which lay before him: in the preface to the Epistles to the Corinthians, they were augmented to eighty-one; soon they amounted higher, and with those which he collated after his return to Germany, they were in all a hundred and three Greek MSS., of which indeed many contain only one or another of the Evangelists, only some of Paul's Epistles, or merely fragments; but there are also those, such as *k. l.*, which comprise the whole New Testament, or at least a half of it; or comprehend the third part, the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles; and among these are some which, on account of their antiquity, are peculiarly valuable, as V. and *g.* He has besides, extracted with discrimination useful elucidations from those copies, which are furnished with Scholia. All these collections he has published in twelve parts, from the year 1782 to 1788, 8vo.

He not merely consulted his MSS. in particular places, but extracted them from the beginning to the end with great care. He has also given good descriptions of them, added engraved specimens of several of them, with which he has greatly embellished his work, and rendered it very useful, having facilitated by these aids the experienced reader's judgment on them.

No one can deny to him the acquisition of a distinguished and imperishable merit as to the criticism of the New Testament: I easily comprehend, how a man, who has applied a fair portion of life to this insipid labour, becomes so susceptible of each little censure, and therefore I readily suppress the wish, which I might have made to him. But it has always been one of my chief wishes, to be able to expunge from his work some violent pasages, that none of those, who come after us, might be disturbed in

his veneration of a man, who has so many and valid claims to it.

He had not yet published the last part, when Charles Alter, Professor in the Gymnasium at Vienna, appeared before the public with three and twenty Greek MSS. belonging to the Royal Library. He took for the basis of his collation, MS. *Lambec.* N. I. in Nessel N. xxiii., and in Griesbach 218, which, comprehends the whole New Testament by the side of the Old, with the exception of some defects in Apoc. xiii. He caused the whole of this MS. to be printed in the first part, except the passages where it contains manifest errors, which he supplied from the first edition of Stephanus. Yet, that we might have the Codex entirely as it is, he also added these errors in an appendix.

With it, he then collated in the 2nd and 3rd parts, the following MSS.: two, which contain the whole New Testament, excepting the Apocalypse, viz. Wetstein's N. 3. and Wetstein's 75. in Griesbach 76., from which Gerhard of Mastricht has superficially extracted. Then, eight copies of the four Gospels, one being Matthew, and the celebrated fragment from Luke, marked N. in Wetstein, and two Evangelistaries: then, four copies of the Acts, Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, one of which contains the Apocalypse: a MS. with twelve Epistles of Paul, and two which have only the Apocalypse. To these he added a new collation of the printed Coptic text, and some MSS. of the Sclavonic version, as well as passages of the more ancient Latin version.

Hermann Treschow gave a description of the greater part of these MSS., and some specimens of them also in his Tentamen Descriptionis Codicum vet. aliquot Græcorum Novi Fæderis Manuscriptorum, qui in Bibliothecâ Cæsareâ Vindobonensi asservantur.

Hauniæ, 1773, 8vo. We might indeed have expected from the editor some account of those which Treschow has not described, such as *Lambec.* xxviii. xxxii. xxxiii. The plan of this work is so laid, that its use is combined with circumstantialities, which should not be increased in such piecemeal performances. It is well known that Birch examined some of these MSS., and has occasionally communicated other readings from them, as we here find in his list; whence it seems to me, that the meed of accuracy more frequently belongs to Birch. There is yet a beautiful Novum Testamentum Vindobonense, which exclusively proceeded from the treasures of the Royal Library. It appeared under the title, Nov. Test. ad Codicem Vindobonensem Græcè expressum, varietatem Lectionis addidit Carolus Alter. Viennæ, 1787. 8vo., 3 parts.

That was indeed a Golden Age for criticism, in which scholars emulated with each other, to produce documents from their concealment, and deliver them to the general use of the world. Among these, Andreas Birch, Professor at Copenhagen, may lay claim to a distinguished merit. He examined for the Royal Danish edition of the New Testament several MSS.; some he partly collated, others entirely, which appeared to be most deserving of it. The famous Vatican MS. 1209. called B. in criticism, was first on the list, to which he devoted a singular industry in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the Acts, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles. In Luke and John he obtained, by means of Woide, the collation which had been made for Bentley. He then twice collated Cod. Vat. 354. of the Gospels written in the year 949. in uncial characters; Cod. Vat. 1057. also in uncial characters, Cod. Vat. 349. of the Gospels, Cod. Vat. 360. Urbino-Vat. 2. of the Gospels, which

according to the subscription, came from a very ancient copy, twice with accuracy, not to speak of the extracts, which he made from other Roman MSS., from those of the Library at Vienna, from the Library of St. Mark at Venice, at Florence, or those which he obtained by means of Moldenhauer from the MSS. of the Escurial, by means of Hensler from the Library at Copenhagen. Lastly, Adler also enriched his compilations by the collation of the Gospels according to the Syro-Hierosolymitan version, as he calls it, and by the various readings of two other Syriac versions. He has given the description of these documents, and of their execution in copious Prolegomena, which precede the work, which appeared with considerable typographical beauty under the following title: Quatuor Evangelia Græcè cum variantibus à textu Lectionibus Codd. MSS. Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, Barberinæ, Laurentinianæ, Vindobonensis, Escurialensis, Hauniensis Regiæ, quibus accedunt Lectiones versionum Syrarum, Veteris, Philoxenianæ, et Hierosolymitanæ. Jussû et sumptibus Regis edidit Andreas Birch, Hauniæ. A. MDCCLXXXVIII. excud. J. F. Schultz. Univ. Typog. 4to.

A great number of the impressions of this first part, and the apparatus for the second were destroyed in the unfortunate fire at Copenhagen, in June 1795, and Birch then separately published his collations from the Acts, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, and also the Apocalypse°.

° Variæ Lectiones ad textum Act. App. Epp. Catholicarum et Pauli è Codd. Græcis MSS. Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, &c., collectæ et editæ ab Andreâ Birch SS. Theol. Doctore et Prof. &c. Hauniæ. A. C. MDCCXCVIII. 8vo.

Variæ Lectiones ad textum Apocalypseos, ex Codd. Græcis, MSS. &c. collectæ et editæ ab Andreâ Birch, &c. Hauniæ, A. C. MDCCC. Prostant apud Proft, et Storch.

Besides the Vatican MSS. 1209. and 1210. whose collation is here continued, Vat. 367. of the Acts, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, a very remarkable book, was extracted with uncommon diligence, as well as Pio-Vat. 50., and Alexandrino-Vat. 29., the last of which is only preserved as far as the Epistle to the Ephesians. Besides these, Borgian. 4. and Venet. 10., which also contain the Apocalypse, were entirely collated by Engelbreth. Yet, the MSS. of the Roman, Viennese, and other Libraries, which were examined only in particular chapters or epistles, are very numerous.

On the Apocalypse, besides the two MSS. mentioned above, Vat. 356., Vat. 579., Vat. 1136., Vat. 1166., Alex.-Vat. 68., Pio-Vat. 50., were collated from the beginning to the end.

The whole of this treasure, which, in the mean time, was added to the critical apparatus, a man, whose uncommon ability in critical works of this description we have praised above, comprised, arranged so as to be seen at once, and converted into another edition of the New Testament. With this he adorned the evening of a laborious and meritorious life, and left behind him a memory full of honour by means of this work, which, in the multitude of critical materials which time daily develops, may be surpassed, but in clear and correct judgment scarcely will be. Its title is, Novum Testamentum Græcè. Textum ad fidem Codicum, Versionum, et Patrum recensuit et Lectionis varietatem adjecit D. Jo. Jac. Griesbach. Volumen i—iv. Evangelia complectens. Editio secunda, emendatior, multoque locupletior. Halæ Saxon. ap. J. Jac. Curtii hæredes et Londini apud Petrum Elmsley, 1796, 8vo. The second part is Nov. Test. as before. Volumen ii. Acta, Epistolas Apostolorum cum Apocalypsi complectens. Edit.

CHAPTER VIII.

VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECTION LXI.

By these means, which we have hitherto considered, the Greek text was from its first publication handed down to us through a course of centuries: it was likewise multiplied among us, by the new invention of printing:—these pains were bestowed upon it, for the sake of bringing it nearer to its original state, the traces of which had been so much obliterated in process of time; and these preparations were made for futurity, which hereafter might approximate it to the mark, at which as yet it could not arrive.

Yet have we documents which are much older than the most ancient MSS., and which, in promoting this object, are of uncommon value. They are not in Greek, but in foreign languages, and even if the original text were lost, would be unable to restore to us a Greek passage.

This is preserved; but through the contradictions of MSS., it is so unlike to its original state, that we are forced to inquire what part of it we would adopt, and what part of it we would reject. Yet, since we have before us the Greek expressions and passages (the adoption or rejection of which frequently becomes a question), these documents are capable of informing us, whether they had any critical principle, and

what were their expressions, arrangement, and order —what they read—what stood in the Greek copies in their days, from whence their matter was derived.

This is the service which the ancient versions can render to us: so far are they of use in criticism:— and, as far as the age of the witnesses deserves regard, some will even highly prize the MSS. We are inclined to set a value on them beyond that of their exegetical use in obscure passages, since their authors were approximated to the time, the place, and mode of thinking of the Biblical writers.

But this prerogative can only be the portion of immediate versions: for those which are mediate, *i. e.* which are again made from versions, may indeed shew us the readings of the mother-version, from whence they proceed, but not of the Greek text;— they may contribute something to the explanation of their mother-version, but not to that of the original text, which they do not express. Yet, above every thing, the versions must have been prepared with such care and critical fidelity, for reliance to have been placed on the editions of them.

We propose, as far as it is practicable, to arrange them according to their countries, and first to treat of the Asiatic, then of the African, and lastly of those, which arose in Europe.

SYRIAC VERSIONS.

THE FIRST AND MOST ANCIENT OF THESE.

SECTION LXII.

Among the versions of the New Testament, which the Syrians possessed in their native tongue, according to their unanimous declaration, the Peschito is the oldest. According to some, it was called ܦܫܝܛܐ or *literal*, to express the peculiar quality, for which it is distinguished. Yet is it far from being scrupulously literal, but without detriment to fidelity, it maintains a free style, whilst it appears to agree with this title, and the interpretation attributed to it. Abu'lfaraj gives another exposition of it, averring, that it was applied to it less for having regard to elegance and polish of language, than to accuracy [p].

A תרגם with the Jews, is a representation of words in another tongue. But they attribute *a double sense to the term* in the sacred books, viz. פשט or the mere signification of words, and מדרש or the learned and allegorical sense [q]. According to the Chaldee form פשט becomes פשיט, and according to the Syriac ܦܫܝܛܐ. The version of the Old Testament recognizes the Hebrew text, as the source, and is consequently the labour of Jews at a very early

[p] Greg. Abu'lfaragii Hist. Dynast. Dyn. vi. p. 100 (Arabic text).

[q] Hottinger, Thesaurus Philologic. seu clavis Sacr. Scripturæ. Edit. iii. l. i. c. ii. § 7. de sensû Sacr. Script. p. 233-37. Schickard, Bechinath Happerushim, Disput. vi. p. 116.

period, from whom it received the name. When the New Testament was added to it, it was also included under this term.

The Chaldee Targumin (we are speaking of the two oldest) were easily completed: for the most part they were not even obliged to change the words, but merely to alter the forms; but the Syriac was forced frequently to choose other expressions, and to follow its own grammatical construction, from whence the version differed from the preceding translation, and in exhibiting the force of words, passed over into פשוט, from which peculiarity, in my opinion, this version acquired the name of ܦܫܝܛܬܐ.

SECTION LXIII.

The translator made his version from a Greek copy. This is proved by the numerous words, which he has retained from the Greek, exactly in the place and passage, where they occur in the original text, although frequently there were pure Syriac expressions for them. In no place have I found more, than in the 27th chapter of Matthew: it is therefore particularly adapted to be alleged as a specimen. In this, at ver. 11, 12. ἡγεμων, 6. τιμη, 7. ἀγρος, ξενος, 19. βημα, 27. στρατιωται, σπειρα, 28. χλαμυς, 30. προσωπον [r], 38. λῃσται, 48. σπογγος,—no less than eleven words so occur, all of which, except the title ἡγεμων, the Syrian had in his language, and probably for the last also, he would have found a corresponding expression, as well as for the others, if that in his own tongue had failed him.

[r] The reading, ἐμπτυσαντες εἰς το προσωπον αὐτου, suggested it here to him, which Cod. Vercell. and Veroneus. apud Blanchini, also have.

Who will deny, that these words were current in Syria, after the government of the Seleucidæ? But, that he used all these foreign names in preference to those in his native tongue as often, and as they occur in the Greek Gospel, we can only conceive from the supposition, that he was induced to do so by the Greek text, which lay before him*. But, Matthew in this chapter has also introduced into the Greek, some words from the Romans, *e. g.* ver. 26. φραγελλωσας, 27. πραιτωριον, 65, 66. κουστωδια, which the Syrian faithfully restores in these places. This custom pervades all the books of the New Testament, and proves therefore that what we have inferred from a particular section of the Evangelist, applies still more to the whole.

The translator has here and there committed errors, which could only have been occasioned by the Greek text: *e. g.* Matt. xi. 19. και ἐδικαιωθη ἡ σοφια ἀπο των τεκνων αὐτης, which he translates *by their arts*, having read τεχνων for τεκνων: Matt. xxiii. 26. και της παροψιδος he renders *brim* or *handle*, which could only have happened by reading ἀψιδος, or rather ταραψιδος in an unusual connexion. Mark vi. 1. he mistook ἠκολληθησαν for ἠκολουθησαν, and Luke ix. 42. ἐῤῥηξεν for ἐῤῥηξεν. The etymology of ἐση ζωγρων at v. 10. is also remarkable: THOU SHALT CATCH ALIVE. In Acts ix. 1. instead of ἐμπνεων, he read ἐμπλεως, and Acts xvi. 29. instead of αἰτησας—αἰσθησας. He also committed a stranger mistake in Acts xviii. 7. where instead of ὀνοματι Ἰουστου σεβομενου, he read "IN THE NAME OF TITUS, WHO FEARED GOD;" consequently, he thus divided it, ONOMA—THOYΣ—TOY—ΣΕ-

* Bar Bahlûl, Bar Hebræus, and most of the Syriac works, with which we are acquainted, are equally full of Greek words.—TRANSLATOR.

BOMENOY and lengthened the upper stroke of the two iotas, in ΤΙΙΟΥΣ[1], until it became ΤΙΤΟΥΣ. In the Epistle to the Romans, ii. 18. he changes διαφεροντα into συμφεροντα: Gal. ii. 2. he must have read κατ' ιδιαν τοις δοκουσι—κατιδων τοις δοκ—since he translated it ܒܚܕܐ. Eph. vi. 2. he changes ἐπουρανιοις into ὑπουρανιοις, and Phil. ii. 16. Λογον ζωης into τοπον ζωης. In James ii. 13. ΚΑΤΑΚΑΥΧΑΤΑΙΕΛΕΟΣ—he added the last syllable of the verb to ἐλεος, and for ΑΙ read ΔΙ—ΔΙ-ΕΔΕΟΣ:—instead of the remaining ΚΑΤΑΚΑΥΧΑΤ he read ΚΑΤΑΥΧΕΤΕ, whence arose καταυχετε δι' ἐλεος κρισεως, as he has expressed it in his version.

SECTION LXIV.

As far as we know of them, the MSS. of the Peschito, with the exception of one, have only the Epistle of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John, of the Catholic Epistles. Of these they therefore have four less than the Greek MSS., and the Apocalypse, likewise is wanting to them. The four other Epistles in the Syrian version do not come near to the Peschito, either in the mode of translating an original writing into a foreign tongue, or in the other ideas of the author. They are forced, and laboriously adapted to the letter of the text, without regard to purity of diction, and without a happy notion of the sense of the original, and were undertaken with little knowledge of the matter. Pococke found them in a MS. belonging to the Bodleian Library, which contained

[1] Hug's conjecture will not completely avail, in this instance, because there is a Σ, which is left unexplained.—Translator.

the Acts of the Apostles, according to the ancient version, the three generally recognized Catholic Epistles, and these besides, which he separately edited [u].

Dionysius Bar Salibi, a Syriac writer of the 12th century, says, in his remarks on the Philoxenian version of the Catholic Epistles in the preface to the 2d. Ep. of Peter: that "the second Epistle of Peter was not translated with the rest of the Scriptures, which were anciently rendered into Syriac, and is only found in the version of Bishop Thomas of Charkel [v]."

We are more early informed by Cosmas, an Egyptian Scholar, known in the middle of the sixth century, by his Oriental voyages of the Indian Sailor, that only three Catholic Epistles were found among the Syrians: that of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John [x].

But, to revert to Dionysius Bar Salibi, and his assertion, which maintains these Epistles only to have been found in the translation of Bishop Thomas of Charkel, he must mean the Philoxenian version, which

[u] The remaining title follows the three lines of the Syriac inscription. Epistolæ quatuor, Petri secunda, Johannis secunda et tertia, et Judæ fratris Jacobi, una ex celeberr. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ Oxon. MS. exemplari nunc primum depromptæ, et charactere Hebræo, versione Latinâ, notisque quibusdam insignitæ, operâ et studio Edvardi Pococke, Angli-Oxoniensis. Lugdun. Bat. ex officinâ Bonavent. et Abrah. Elzevir. Acad. Typog. A. 1630. 4. From this edition, in consequence of a work of Antony Vitré against Gabriel Sionita, these four Epistles were inserted in the Parisian Polyglott: the differences between the two editions are, therefore, merely the arbitrary alterations of Sionita.

[v] Pococke in Præf. ad quatuor Epist. Cath. Cf. Hassenkamp's Remarks on the last § §. of Michaelis's Introduction. P. 14. 15.

[x] Cosmas Indico illust. de Mund. L. vii. in Galland's Biblioth. Patrum T. xi. p. 535. Παρα Συροις δε ει μη αι τρεις μοναι αι προγεγραμμεναι ουχ ευρισκονται· λεγω δε Ιακωβου, Πετρου, και Ιωαννου.

we shall soon see, that Thomas of Charkel, afterwards Bishop of Germanicia, criticized. Bar Salibi certainly knew nothing of the Epistles, which since the days of Pococke have been received into the editions of the Peschito; nevertheless, although they sometimes approach very near to the Philoxenian, they are perfectly distinct from them in readings, in the choice of words, and the freedom of their style.

Yet, were we to conclude from the words of Dionysius Bar Salibi, that Thomas had made a translation of his own of the Epistles, of which we are speaking, the declaration of the writer were still untrue on another ground; for they were not merely to be found in the version of Thomas of Charkel, but also in the Philoxenian. The more probable however must therefore remain to be the case, that Bar Salibi knew nothing of the version of the four Epistles, which are now printed in the editions of the Peschito.

Besides, the Apocalypse also is wanting in the MSS. of the Peschito, as we have already said. At least, that which appears after some editions of the Peschito, is certainly no part of it, if we may judge from its quality. In the mode of translation, it rather agrees with the four above-mentioned Epistles; *e. g.* in the custom of expressing ὁ, ἡ, το by ܐܝ, ܕܐܝ, &c., which often occurs in a single verse, even to insipidity, as Apoc. v. 5., where it occurs four times, and is only necessary once; or in the more particular care of rendering ἐστι and εἰσι by ܐܝܬ and ܕܐܝܬ: also, in the ungrammatical omission of every affix after nouns and verbs, which were always suffixed with the particle ܗܘ to mark the substantiality of αὐτος, αὐτη in Greek:—Apoc. ii. 13. this occurs no less than five times in one verse.

If this version be not the Philoxenian, it at least

originated from it. The learned assure us, that it does not entirely agree, nor entirely differ from it; but the description of the MS., by which it was first made known, points back to the Philoxenian version. "Versuum distinctiones," so is the MS. described, "libellus iste propriè habet nullas, et nec capitula nisi quæ à lectore quodam, nescio quo, nostris numeris adscripta fuerunt. Sententiarum tamen *distinctiones habet varias*, quarum quædam longiores, aliæ breviores periodos discernere videntur, quas nos hic non gravatè omisimus, tùm, quia typographus iis carebat, tùm quia nos certum earum usum non deprendebamus. Aliquando enim *totæ paginæ habet nullam*, interdum *una multas*, ac nonnunquàm sine ullâ sententiæ distinctione solius Elegantiæ causâ cumulatos, priores *quatuor punctis rubris, circulum nigrum oculi formâ constantem, quadrangulari formâ continentibus*: posteriores, *quatuor solummodo punctis, duobus rectis rubris, aliis transversis nigris* junguntur. Aliæ etiàm insigniuntur, &c." And, in some pages afterwards: "non est autem dissimulandum, in ipsius *Autographi margine* errata varia à lectore quodam, nescio quo, sed aliâ manû, alio atramento emendata conspici: item *verba quædam in Autographo occurrisse redundantia, aut his scripta*, quæ manifestò sensum vitiarent, quæ nos resecuimus."

This MS. was written by one Caspar, a native of India, as he calls himself at the end of it [y]. He however resided in the West (as it seems), and belonged to the congregatio de propagandâ fide. The Orphan-Asylum-Library at Halle possesses a written Liturgy of the Chaldæan ceremonies in Syriac characters, which an

[y] Adler quotes several Syriac MSS. of the New Testament written in India. in Vers. Syriac. denuo examinatæ. Hafniæ 1789. 4. p. 24, 25, 26.

ancient hand has entitled: "Ordo Baptizandi juxtà ritum Chaldæorum, linguâ Chaldaicâ, ... descriptus per Gaspar de Malavar, Indum, Romæ, mense Julii MDLXXX." The name and country of the transcriber are on both sides of it; a comparison of the characters might bring the matter to a decision.

The printed Syriac version of the Apocalypse formerly belonged to the younger Scaliger; from thence, it came into the Academical Library at Leyden, from which MS. Louis de Dieu edited it[2], and from his preface we have extracted the preceding description of the MS. Its text was afterwards incorporated into the Polyglots of Paris and London, and subjoined to some editions of the Peschito.

SECTION LXV.

The copies of the ancient Syriac version therefore at least, had not the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Epistle of Jude, since the sixth century, nor had they an Apocalypse, although we know not how long they were without it. Yet, the Greek Bibles contained all these treatises, and it does not appear, that they were any where banished from the Sacred Codex, however much opinions were divided about them.

I cannot persuade myself, that the Peschito did

[1] Herbert Marsh's remarks and additions to John David Michaelis's Introduction to the New Test. transl. by Rosenmüller. P. 1. Gött. 1795. 4. § 102.

[2] Apocalypsis Sancti Johannis, ex manuscripto exemplari è Bibliothecâ clariss. Viri Josephi Scaligeri deprompta, charactere Syro et Ebræo, cum versione Latinâ et notis, operâ et studio Ludovici de Dieu. Lugd. Bat. ex Typ. Elzevirianâ. 1627. 4. This edition was again printed after Lud. de Dieu's Critica Sacra, fol. Amstel. 1683.

not originally contain the Apocalypse, since such important witnesses in the East have decided in its favour, such as Justin Martyr in Palæstine, and Theophilus of Antioch, the chief of the most respectable Churches in Syria; or it must otherwise be, that the Peschito was made immediately after the anti-allegorical controversies of Nepos, when several of the Oriental Teachers has concurred in the opinion of Dionysius Alexandrinus; viz. late in the third, or in the beginning of the fourth century, of which I can still much less persuade myself.

Each of these hypotheses being improbable, a third remains, viz. this—that the Apocalypse may have been gradually omitted from the books of the old Syriac version.

The proof of it is very simple, Ephræm frequently quotes the Apocalypse, as well in his works, which still exist in the original tongue, as in those, which were translated into Greek in the fourth and following centuries [b], naming the author in his quotations. Ephræm could not have done this, had not a Syriac version of it existed, since he did not understand Greek.

I am well aware, that it has been sometimes asserted by the learned, that Ephræm was acquainted with Greek, without mentioning their authority for that, which they so unhesitatingly declare. The contrary is however very well known from ancient and valuable documents; Sozomenus, himself an Oriental, born in Palæstine, educated in the Phœnician BARUTH, then a famous school, and not far distant in time from the days of Ephræm, says so, and Theodoret of Antioch, Bishop of Cyr, in Syria, even

[b] Opp. Syr. T. ii. p. 332. Opp. Gr. T. ii. p. 53 et p. 194.

expresses his surprize, that without a knowledge of Greek, he should have been able so successfully to have controverted the Greek Heretics [c].

One or the other of the learned men, perhaps, erred in mistaking for him Ephræm, the Patriarch of Teupolis, to whom Photius attributes a more than ordinary education in the language and literature of the Greeks, besides his knowledge of Syriac [d].

Yet, a more modern author of high estimation in Biblical criticism, even names to us his instructor in Greek, viz. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea; I cannot say on what authority, since I only know some extracts of the writing, in which he makes this assertion [e]. But, the authorities for it could not have been great, since Basil's brother (if it were not indeed himself) an ancient and respected writer, who wrote a life of Ephræm, knew nothing of it. He informs us, that Ephræm had been on a visit to Basil:—on a visit at a period of life, when an attempt to learn languages no longer succeeds, when Ephræm had already become [f] famous for his works. Ephræm himself also speaks of his visit: he says, that the Bishop addressed him by means of an interpreter, and communicates to us the subject of their conversation [g].

He must therefore indeed have learned Greek late

[c] Sozom. H. E. L. iii. c. 16. Περι ἑλληνικης παιδειας ἀμοιρος. Theod. Hist. E. L. iv. c. 29. Παιδειας γαρ οὐ γεγευμενος ἑλληνικης, τους τε πολυσχεδεις των ἑλληνων διεληγξε πλανους, κ. τ. λ.

[d] Photius, Cod. 228.

[e] Sphon de ratione textûs Biblici in Ephræmi Syri commentariis obvii, ejusque usû critico. Leips. 1786-4. Eichhorn's General Library of Biblical Literature, V. i. 1 Pt. p. 137.

[f] Gregorii Nysseni de vitâ Ephræm Syri, &c. Opp. T. iii. p. 605. Edit. Ducæi.

[g] Cotelerii Monum. Eccl. Gr. T. iii. p. 58. Basilii vita in Opp. Bas. T. iii. Garnerii, § xxix. N. 4. Ephræm. Encom. Basilii, T. iii. Opp. Ed. Vossii, Colon. 1603, fol. p. 712.

in life, and in a very quick and wonderful manner; —indeed, in a very strange manner, as a life of Basil written by Amphilochus represents the affair. The Biographer reports, that Basil, during the visit of three days, which the Syrian teacher paid to him, obtained from God by his prayers, that his guest might be able to speak Greek, which to his own astonishment he instantly did [h]. If we reject the miracle, a TRIFOLIUM GRÆCUM still remains; but this is badly authenticated, according to the correct judgment, which critics long since have pronounced on this biography.

Now, if he never learnt Greek, if he did not understand it, there must have been a Syriac version of the Apocalypse, in which he read it. The same applied to the Epistle of Jude, to the second of Peter, and to the second of John [i].

The learned men of Göttingen have, on the other hand, objected, that Ephræm has even quoted Greek words in his commentaries. Yet, these are only single words, and in very few places, which, were he desirous of knowing how the seventy had translated them, he might easily ascertain by inquiring from the brethren of his community. I do not give this answer from mere hypothesis: his Syrian Biographer offers it to me. He says, that when Ephræm went to Egypt, he took one of his scholars with him, as a Greek interpreter [k]. Once for all, we have in this passage a confirmation of the first point, that Greek

[h] Gerard. Voss. T. i. Opp. Ephræm, p. xiii.

[i] These Epistles are quoted by Ephræm in the following places: Ep. Jude, T. i. Opp. Syr. p. 136. Opp. Gr. T. iii. p. 62. 63. 2 Pet. T. ii. Opp. Syr. p. 342. Opp. Gr. T. ii. p. 387. 2 John T. i. Opp. Gr. p. 76. T. iii. p. 52.

[k] Vita S. Ephr. § 15. p. 39. Asseman. Biblioth. Or. T. i.

was unknown to him, and a discovery of the [1] other, how he obtained these solitary words in his commentary. Let me therefore be pardoned for persisting in the assertion, that Ephræm read in some version the disputed Epistles and the Apocalypse, which he frequently quotes.

SECTION LXVI.

But, whilst we are endeavouring to restore some parts of the ancient Syriac version, which have been severed from it in later times, a celebrated individual has employed himself in depriving it of very unsuspected possessions, which no one, before him, has assailed:—viz. the Epistle to the Hebrews [m].

He says, that this Epistle in those passages, where Paul has appealed to the Old Testament, quotes them after the Peschito; from whence he infers, that it must have been later translated, than the other books of the New Testament, in which this is not the case. According to this, it may assuredly be supposed, that the Christians had first translated the New, and then the Old Testament into Syriac. But this celebrated writer should not have contented himself with hypothesis, where recourse might be had to matter of fact. For the same happens in the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles: not indeed,

1 The preceding observation respecting the multitude of Greek words, which probably ever since the days of the Seleucidæ were incorporated into the Syriac, and were on many occasions used, even where pure Syriac terms expressive of the same thing existed, contains a satisfactory reply to the objection proposed by the literati of Göttingen.—TRANSLATOR.

[m] Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, P. i. § 53. page 363. fourth edition.

in every instance, but only, as it seems, where passages from the Syriac Old Testament were fresh in the memory of the translator, or when he could easily find them. The quotation in Matt. xix. 4, 5. is accurately transcribed from the Syriac version of Gen. iii. 24.—cr—Matt. xxi. 5., with the omission of those words, which do not occur in the Evangelist, is taken from the Syriac version of Zach. ix. 9., although this does not express the υἱον ὑποζυγιου of Matthew. Sometimes the Old Testament is subjected to alterations, where these are necessary to approach nearer to the words of the New: thus, Matt. xii. 18. the beginning of the passage is not taken from the Syriac Isaiah xlii. 2.: but the two verses from οὐδε κραυγασει to τυφομενον οὐ σβεσει, are entirely from thence. In like manner, Matt. xiii. 14. from ἀκοῃ ἀκουσετε to του λαου τουτου is quoted without alteration from Isaiah vi. 9. but, the remainder is more strongly adapted to the words of Matthew.

The long passage in Acts iv. 25—29. is wholly inserted from the 2d Psalm of the Peschito, and Acts viii. 32, 33. from Psalm liii. 7. is inserted according to the Syriac version of that Prophet, except one word, which does not occur in Luke. Rom. ix. 29. is preserved from Isaiah i. 9. and Rom. xi. 9, 10. from Psalm lxix. 24, 25., although they do not perfectly accord with the words of Paul.

The hypothesis (as this scholar says) which might be started, that the Christians had not translated the Old Testament before the New, may be true, for aught I care: yet, how would the case be, if the Jews translated it? They might indeed have had for a long time a Syriac Targum, as others a Chaldee. The fact before us demands this to have been the case, and thus two other remarkable points will be explained. The first, that the Syriac Old

Testament was made from the Hebrew; the second, that it was frequently modified according to the Septuagint. The Jews did the former: the Christians, who for some time had been accustomed to the Alexandrine version, the latter.

Thus, will the principal objection against this Epistle, on which Michaelis has laid a particular stress, fall to the ground of itself. "In all the other parts of the version of the New Testament, the High Priest is constantly called, ܟܗܢܐ ܪܒܐ, but in the Epistle to the Hebrews, he is called ܟܗܢܐ ܪܒ ܟܗܢܐ, which is a proof that the latter was translated by another interpreter." What an important deduction from one word!

Paul to prove the High Priesthood of Christ quotes Psalm cx. 4., and his translator took the quoted passage from the Syriac Psalter, where the expressions are, ܐܢܬ ܟܗܢܐ ܠܥܠܡ ܟܕܡܠܟܝ. Now, from the terms used in the premises (Heb. v. 6.) he could not have used ܟܗܢܐ in the consequence, but he must have concluded, therefore is HE ܟܗܢܐ. He could not say, it is written, he is SUMMUS SACERDOS, and then in his version, have deduced the consequence, therefore, is he SUMMUS PONTIFEX. In justification of such a consequence, the identity of the two expressions must first be shown, to join the premises and the consequence, and the translator by this change of words would have taken the validity from his argument. In C. vii. 17. this proof again occurs, and is connected with the subject of the Epistle throughout by many passages branching out from or succeeding to it, so that the interpreter, had he been ever so much accustomed to the word ܟܗܢܐ, was obliged to renounce his custom, and confine himself to that expression, in this Epistle, which the Biblical cita-

tion adduced in proof, as he quotes it, obliged him to do.

Hence, are we not authorized, because the author of the version does not in another place select exactly this or that word, which he had used before, or does not generally express the same passage exactly in the same terms, in arguing a different mode of translating and from thence the personal difference of the translator, as a foreign[n] scholar has done. If the same and very simple passage ὁ δικαιος ἐκ πιστεως ζησεται, Rom. i. 17.—ܙܕܝܩ ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܢܚܐ ܘܚܝ; be elsewhere rendered, Gal. iii. 11. ܙܕܝܩ ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܢܚܐ ܘܚܝ;!;, shall we on this account presume to ascribe the Epistle to the Romans, and that to the Galatians, to a different translator?

The same expressions also often occur in other senses: at least they appear so in the judgment of the translator. This is the case in Heb. x. 29. in regard to the word κοινος. The sense *unclean*, which is expressed by ܡܣܐܒ, must certainly have sounded harsh to the translator, and ܦܠ which is elsewhere placed for it in the Peschito, means *something common*, which is not suited to this place. Tit. i. 4., Acts iv. 32. Now then, he had to decide: he was forced to chuse, as he has done, a peculiar expression, for a very peculiar sense, "*who accounteth the blood of the covenant, as common human blood,*" ;ܕܡܐ ܕܒܪܢܫ.

To assert a difference of the translator from the use of different expressions, a greater chain of proof is required, than the number of three or four words. Let us therefore continue to pay attention to the reasonable confession, which the German opponent of

[n] Herbert Marsh's remarks and additions to Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament. German translation, P. 1. pages 136, 37.

this Epistle has prefixed to his very objections, which does not refer to individual words, but has respect to the performance of the translator, to his judgment, taste, and capability. "The version of this Epistle, indeed, (says Michaelis) has a considerable similarity to the Peschito, it has the same pure and easy Syriac style, it has the same freedom opposed to slavish and literal translation, probably also it has the same intrinsic worth." So far his words go: and now it will be also well to call to mind the circumstance, that Ephræm had indeed a version, and as we perceive, notwithstanding his free citation of some passages, that he had this version in his Biblical Codex, and made use of it in his Syriac works.

It has indeed seemed to me, that the Peschito of the New Testament is not entirely the work of one hand. The style of the translator appears to me freer in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles, than in the Gospels: and I have even fancied, that I have remarked some difference in the diction. But, I have not so carefully noted down my observations, for them to form a consecutively demonstrative and argumentative chain of assertions.

The Greek text, from which the Peschito is formed, has the following characteristic peculiarities. It contains many readings, which only occur in the writings of the Fathers as far as the third century: some of its particularities are occasionally found in the copies of the older Latin translation before Jerome, and several of them in the famous MS., remarkable for its freedom of style, which is preserved at Cambridge. It adheres to no other text, nor follows any undeviatingly, but at one time harmonizes with this, and at another with that; frequently, it is independent of any, following its own will. Yet it has not such a striking variation from the greater number of MSS.,

as the copies of Clemens Alexandrinus seem to have had, or those of the Latins before Jerome, and although it often agrees closely with the Cambridge MS., its peculiar readings are not by far so great and numerous as those in it.

We therefore perceive, that this text was arranged after no prescribed form, and that the Codex, from which the translator laboured, belongs to no family of MSS., that at one time it has readings parallel to this, at another to that copy, but, that actually it adheres to no class, and is on the whole independent and unassociated with any.

According to these correct and true remarks, neither Syria nor Palæstine was then in possession of those recensions, which at the period, when the translation was undertaken, had established a harmony and a fixed text in their Biblical MSS. It therefore must have been composed, at least, in the first half of the third century, unless perchance the purer and uncorrupted state, by which it is exalted above the text of this epoch, could indeed claim for it a higher antiquity.

SECTION LXVIII.

So far do the critical vestiges lead us in an inquiry into this document, with regard to the time of its origin. Now, we would see, what other data teach us further respecting it.

The works of Ephræm Syrus, in which this version is cited [o], attest that it was used in the Churches, in the first half of the fourth century. Jacob of

[o] Storr, Obss. super Novi Testamenti versionibus Syriacis.—Stuttgardiæ, 1772. § 4. p. 10—14.

Nisibis ranked before him, as a Syriah writer, whom some call Ephræm's preceptor, who must have required a Syriac Bible in his exhortations to the people. Archelaus, Bishop of *Karrchara*, *Kashara*, *Karhæ*, for so the Greek writers, at different times, express it, published a refutation of Manes in Syriac, from which a translation was made into Greek, in the following century [p]. These are manifest indications of the existence of a Syriac Literature, the commencement of which was, probably, not far remote from this time.

All these indications do not occur in the Roman division of Syria, or within the range of the kingdom planned by Augustus; but, on the Euphrates, at Edessa, Nisibis, Charrhæ, in the northern parts of Mesopotamia, where the petty kings of Osroene and Edessa at one time asserted themselves under the protection of the Parthians, at another of the Romans. Here, the language of the country first unfolded itself after the overthrow of the Seleucidæ, and brought forth many earlier fruits of a native literature.

Here, Bardesanes laboured in Syriac on different branches of learning, in the second century. He published a book *de fato*, the fragments of which disclose a more than ordinary knowledge [q]. He also wrote treatises on the doctrines of Marcion, numerous pamphlets and works against other heretics, which were translated into Greek by his acquain-

[p] Hieronym. de Script. Eccles. V. Archelaus. Archelaus Episcopus Mesopotamiæ librum disputationis suæ, quam habuit adversus Manichæum, exeuntem de Perside, Syro sermone composuit, qui translatus in Græcum habetur à multis. Claruit sub Imperatore Probo, &c.

[q] Euseb. de Præp. Evang. L. vi. c. 10.

tance [r]. Jerome, who had seen them, mentions them in his energetic way: "if even in the translations these beams dart across them, what, think we, must they have been in their original tongue [s]!"

Harmonius, his son, although he had been instructed at Athens in Greek literature, vied with his father's fame, as a Syriac writer, and was the favorite poet of the Syrians, to whose not perfectly pious or orthodox odes, which were received with impassioned pleasure, Ephræm afterwards opposed the sacred poems, which he had compiled from the melodies of Harmonius [t].

If the native literature had reached so high a point in a nation, as it had among the Mesopotamian Christians, in the days of Bardesanes and Harmonius, we may readily believe, that a translation of the Bible, even if it had not yet taken place, at least could not have been very remote; and if works had been translated from Syriac, for the sake of making them known to the Greeks, as the friends of Bardesanes did, translations from the Greek into Syriac must have assuredly preceded them, to have roused and enlivened the national literature. Besides, if controversial writings and polemical treatises composed

[r] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 28. Βαρδησανης ἱκανωτατος τις ἀνηρ, ἐν τῃ των Συρων φωνῃ διαλεκτικωτατος, προς τους κατα Μαρκιωνα και τινας ἑτερους διαφορων προϊσταμενους δογματων, διαλογους συστησαμενος τῃ οἰκειᾳ παραδεδωκε γλωττῃ τε και γραφῃ μετα και πλειστων αὐτου συγγραμματων, οὐς και οἱ γνωριμοι, πλειστοι δε ἡσαν αὐτῳ δυνατως τῳ λογῳ παρισταμενῳ, ἐπι των Ἑλληνων ἀπο της Συρων μεταβεβληκασι φωνης· ἐν οἱς ἐστι και ὁ προς Ἀντωνινον ἱκανωτατος αὐτου περι εἱμαρμενης διαλογος. Ὁσα τε ἀλλα φασιν αὐτον προφασει του τοτε διωγμου συγγραψαι—κ. τ. λ. Cf. Theodoret. Hæret. fab. L. i. c. 22.

[s] De Script. Eccles. V. Bardesanes.

[t] Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. L. iv. c. 29. Hæret. fab. L. i. c. 22. Sozomen. H. E. L. iii. c. 16. Assemanni Biblioth. Orient. T. i. p. 48.

in the language of the people, like those of Bardesanes against Marcion and other heretics, had been received with approbation, and read with interest, the nation certainly must have had the Bible in their own tongue, to have taken an interest, to have been able to enter into the controversy, and its proofs.

We must, therefore, have actual cause to suppose particular impediments with respect to the New Testament, which might have stood in the way of its translation, if such had not been composed in Mesopotamia at least towards the end of the second century. To this we are also led by the observations, which we have shortly before made concerning the state of the text, which was the basis of the Peschito. They conduct us with certainty to the beginning of the third century, and favour likewise a wider step into the second century, if we should any where find occasion for it.

The declaration of a writer, who speaks of the Syriac Gospels in the last half of the second century, here deserves attention. This is Hegesippus, from whose works Eusebius informs us, that he had made quotations from the Gospel *to the Hebrews and from the Syriac*, and in particular from the Hebrew tongue, thus giving us to understand, that he was a believer converted from Judaism[u]: ἐκ τε του καθ' Ἑβραιους εὐαγγελιου και του Συριακου· και ἰδιως ἐκ της Ἑβραϊδος διαλεκτου τινα τιθησιν.

"*From the Gospel to the Hebrews, and from the Syriac*:"—does he connect them as one work, or separate them as two distinct works? He might have connected them; for, the Gospel to the Hebrews, which, as it appears, was written in the Galilæan dialect, might on account of the similarity

[u] Euseb. H. E. L. iv. c. 22.

of the dialect, be well called a Syriac Gospel. But, then, he must have otherwise expressed himself, he must have said, ἐκ του Συριακου καϑ' Ἑβραιους εὐαγγελιου, or του καϑ' Ἑβραιους εὐαγγελιου, του Συριακου—*from the Gospel to the Hebrews written in Syriac.*

As it now stands, "*the Gospel to the Hebrews and the Syriac,*" *the and* distinguishes two objects,—a Gospel to the Hebrews, and a Syriac, *i. e.* Gospel. If the Syriac merely related to the first, AND could not be placed between the two: but according to Greek, Roman and German construction, it must be prefixed, or placed after it, without any thing intermediate—*in Syriaco Evangelio secundum Hebræos,* or *in Evangelio secundum Hebræos Syriaco,* in the Syrian Gospel to the Hebrews—in the Gospel to the Hebrews, the Syrian [x]—in the version of Ulfilas, the Gothic—in the Gothic version of Ulfilas. But, should I say, in the version of Ulfilas AND the Gothic, I should express myself, as if I were placing things by the side of each other, which are to be separated. To be brief: Grammar does not connect any one adjective with its substantive by means of AND, except when several adjectives being used at the same time, a second or a third is included by this conjunction.

If, therefore, we may judge the words of Eusebius according to Grammar, and particularly the rules of his own tongue, in which he writes, it is evident that he speaks of a Gospel to the Hebrews, and of a Syriac Gospel, which last can only be a translation.

[x] His application of this remark to German idiom is lost in the translation: his words are, in dem Evangelium der Hebräer, dem Syrischen—in der Uebersetzung des Ulfilas, der Gothischen. The whole excursus is trivial, as the Greek is sufficiently explicit.—TRANSLATOR.

SECTION LXIX.

This will suffice for the names, sources, state of the text, and age of this version: we have now to enumerate the editions of it.

When Ignatius, Patriarch of Antioch, sent, in the year 1552, his deputy Moses of Merdin to Julius the third at Rome, to state there his confession of faith, he, at the same time, ordered the deputy to cause the Syriac New Testament to be printed in Europe. When his visits to Rome and Venice failed in this object, Moses applied to Albert Widmanstad, the Chancellor of Austria, under King Ferdinand I. Widmanstad had for a long time employed himself on the Syriac language, and so influenced the monarch by means of his zealous intercession, that he defrayed the costs of this work[y]. He and Moses sedulously employed themselves in the revision of the text from two MSS., and in the impression of a beautiful and scarce book, which, besides a Syriac inscription of six lines in Estrangelo, had also the following in Latin. "Liber sacrosancti Evangelii de Jesu Christo Domino et Deo nostro. Reliqua hôc Codice comprehensa pagina proxima indicabit. Div. Ferdinandi Imperatoris designati jussû et liberalitate, characteribus et linguâ Syrâ, Jesu Christo vernaculâ, divino ipsius ore consecratâ, à Joh. Evangelistâ Hebraica dictâ, scriptorio prelo diligenter expressâ." After this comes a Syriac line, and under it, "Principium Sapientiæ Timor Domini[z]."

[y] Cf. Assemani Bibl. Or. T. 1. p. 535. Cf. also Andreæ Mülleri Greiffenhagii Opuscula. Nr. viii. et ix.

[z] There is a detailed and accurate description of this book in Hirt's Oriental and Exegetical Library, Part ii. p. 260. 1. iv. Pt. p. 317.

The Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, have their own title, and each part of this division again reckons its pages from 1: the Epistles of Paul have Roman figures to the pages. The dedication and postscript are both subscribed in the year MDLV., and that the work was really concluded in this year, we perceive from the account, which appears on the last page but one after the letters to G. and Jacob Jones. "In urbe Viennâ, amplissimarum Orientalis Austriæ provinciarum metropoli florentissimâ, ad hunc exitum perductum est divinum hoc opus. Anno à Christi nativitate M.D.LV. XXVII. Septembris. Regiis Impensis. Caspar Craphtus Elvangensis, Suevus, characteres Syros ex norici ferri acie sculpebat. Michael Cymbermannus prelo et operis suis excudebat."

In this edition are wanting the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, that of Jude, and the Apocalypse; also the history of the adulteress, and the passage in 1 John v. 7. Adler has remarked, that the Nestorian MSS. are its basis[a].

The second edition is "Ἡ καινη διαθηκη. Testamentum Novum ܕܝܬܝܩܐ ܚܕܬܐ Est autem interpretatio Syriaca Novi Testamenti Hebræis typis de-

v. Pt. p. 25. In my copy, the Acts of the Apostles immediately follow the Gospels, but in the chapter of contents, it wants the controverted inscription Nov. 5. AD DIV. FERDINANDUM. The dedication AD D. MAXIMILIANUM precedes the Epistles of Paul, but I also miss the inscription of the Catholic Epistles, AD D. CAROLUM AUSTRIACI NOMINIS SECUNDUM. The arms of the printer, from whose press the work issued, are placed on the reverse side of the title-page, with this subscription: cum Rom. Cæs. Maj. gratiâ et privilegio cautum est, ut nemo deinceps hoc opus imprimat. Viennæ Austriæ excudebat Michael Zymmermann, anno M.D.L.XII. is not in mine, nor in many other copies, and appears to have been afterwards added by the Printer, when the Royal Cabinet delivered to him the supply of copies for sale. Hist. Orient. Bibl. Part ii. p. 287. Pt. iv. p. 339.

[a] Nov. Test. version. Syr. denuo examinatæ, p. 39, 40,

scripta, plerisque etiam locis emendata. Eadem Latino sermone reddita. Auctore Immanuele Tremelio Theol. Doctore et professore in Scholâ Heidelbergensi, cujus etiam Grammatica Chaldaïca et Syra calci operis adjecta est. Excudebat Hen. Stephanus, anno MDLXIX." This book contains the Greek text with Beza's translation, and the Syriac in Hebrew characters, with a Latin version, made purposely for it. The foundation of it is Widmanstad's edition, which Tremelius has sometimes emended from a MS. at Heidelberg. Hirt [b] has described the appearance of the work, and Bruns [c] has examined the improvements, which Tremelius has made in the text, and the inadvertent errors of which he has been guilty, in Matt. x. 8., xxvii. 35., Luke xxii. 17, 18., and Acts xv. 34.

The third is twice printed in the fifth part of the Antwerp Polyglott, once with Syriac, and once with Hebrew characters. The Latin translation is by Guy Le Fevre de la Boderie. For this purpose, a MS. was used, which Postel brought from the East, as the preface to the Latin translation of de la Boderie alleges: this MS. is probably the *Codex Coloniensis* [d], from which Rapheleng collected the various readings, which he added to the two following editions.

4. One of them is a Syriac New Testament, with Hebrew characters, without a title-page, in octavo.

[b] Hirt's Oriental Library, P. ii. § 289. Because the dedication was subscribed to Queen Elizabeth at Heidelberg, in the year 1568, some would suppose that there was an earlier edition of this year at Heidelberg; as if the dedication could not have been written, before it was printed.

[c] Bruns' in Repert. for Biblical and Eastern Literature, Pt. xv. p. 153.

[d] Herbert Marsh's remarks and additions to Michaelis's Intr. to the N. T. p. 142. p. 1.

We sometimes meet with it bound up with the Hebrew Bible, from Plantin's press in the year 1573-74. At the end are Variæ Lectiones ex N. T. Syriaci MS. Codice Coloniensi nuper à Fr. Raph. collectæ. Instead of the title-page, these words are placed immediately over the Gospel of Matthew, דיתיקא חדתא.

5. דיתיקא חדתא Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum Syriacè. Antwerpiæ ex officinâ Christophori Plantini, Architypographi Regii MDLXXV. in 16. with Hebrew characters. Variæ Lectiones ex N. T. Syrici *(sic)* manuscripto codice Coloniensi nuper à Franc. Raph. collectæ, are again subjoined as an appendix. Both of Plantin's editions appear to be only an impression from the Antwerp Polyglott.

6. Novum Testamentum, דיתיקא חדתא, ἡ καινη διαθηκη, Novum Jesu Christi D. N. Testamentum ad Christianissimum Galliæ et Poloniæ Regem Henricum iii. Potentissimum et Invictiss. Principem, Christianæ Religionis vindicem et assertorem unicum. Parisiis MDLXXXIII. apud Joannem Benenatum. 4. According to the declaration of Richard Simon, the text of de la Boderie is here again given, and the book belongs to the latter impressions of the Antwerp Polyglott, unless indeed this scholar in the interval added some improvements to the text.

7. Elias Hutter's text in opere duodecim linguarum 1599. is useless to critics.

8. Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum Syriacè cum versione Latinâ ex diversis editionibus diligentissimè recensitum. Accesserunt in fine notationes variantis Lectionis ex quinque impressis editionibus diligenter collectæ à Martino Frostio. 1621. Cothensis Anhaltinorum, 4. Some copies are dated A' 1622; but mine is, in a very extraordinary way, ended a year earlier, than it was begun. The subscription at the end is, Finitum

Cothensis Anhaltinorum xxvi. Septembris Anno Christi MDCXXI, and the year 1622 stands on the title-page. The book is well executed; the Syriac types are good: the editions, of which he made use, are, according to his enumeration of them in the catalogue of various readings, edit. Viennens. Tremel. Guido (Fabric. de la Boderie), and the text of the Antwerp Polyglott: Parisiense exemplar, ann. 1584. N. T. Syriac. Plantini in 8.

9. The Syriac text in the 9th and 10th parts of the Parisian Polyglott, 1645, is taken from the Antwerp, as Vitrè apud Le Long maintains; but Gabriel Sionita made some alterations in it, whether from books or conjectures we know not. The Apocalypse and the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Epistle of Jude, here for the first time appear after the editions of Ludovicus de Dieu and Edward Pocock.

10. The London Polyglott promises an improved text, as the Prolegomena declare: *non ex propriis conjecturis, sed secundum exemplaria MSS.* The history of the Adulteress is taken from a MSS. of the Philoxenian version belonging to Usher: the Apocalypse is printed after de Dieu; the four Catholic Epistles wanting in the Peschito, after Pocock.

11. דיתיקא חדתא, Novum Testam. Syriacè, Sulzbaci, ex offic. Joh. Holst. 1684-12. by Christian Knorre of Rosenroth, is an impression of Plantin's edition in 8. or in 16., after Schaaf's text.

12. Ægid Guthier in his edition of the Syriac New Testament, has far exceeded some of his predecessors in diligence and acumen, and all in utility. It first appeared with Syriac types, at Hamburg, in the year 1664. In the year 1667, a small Lexicon, with various readings from the Parisian and London

Polyglott, was added. The basis of his edition was that of Trostius, in addition to it he availed himself of a MS., which he frequently mentions in the Appendix Lexici Syriaci exhibens variantes punctationes, &c.—Who will not give him credit for honesty, if he even speaks in the preface, of two MSS., of which he has made use? What he has overlooked relative to the history of the Adulteress, and 1 John v. 7. and in other places, Bruns has remarked *.

13. Schaaf, for the most part, followed him in the editions of 1709 and 1717. Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum Syriacum cum versione Latinâ, curâ et studio Johannis Leusden et Caroli Schaaf editum, ad omnes editiones diligenter recensitum, et variis Lectionibus, magno labore collectis, adornatum. Secunda editio à mendis purgata. Lugduni Bat. Typ. Jo. Mulleri. Joh. fil. apud Vid. et fil. Cornel. Boutesteyn, Samuelem Luchtmans. 1717-4.

14. Biblia Sacra quadrilinguia N. T. Græci, cum versione Syriacâ, Græcâ vulgari, Latinâ, et Germanicâ, accurante M. Christ. Reineccio, Lips. 1713. fol. follow Schaaf's text.

Two editions were added to this, intended as presents to the East, of which the one is unknown to us, and the other will shortly appear.

15. Nov. Testam. Syriac. et Arabic. tom. 1mus. ܕܚܕܬܐ ܕܥܕܝܢ ܕܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܐܬܝܗܒ ܒܫܪܝܪܐ ܠܫܘܥܘܒܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܫܒܥ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ. This is in Estrangelo: on the following page, an explicit inscription is found, Sacrosancta Jesu Christi Evangelia jussû congregationis de propagandâ fide ad usum Ecclesiæ nationis Maronitarum edita.

ﺍﻟﻤﻘﺪﺳﺔ ﺍﻷﻧﺎﺟﻴﻞ ﺍﻟﻤﻄﻬﺮﺓ ﻟﺮﺑﻨﺎ ﻳﺴﻮﻉ ﺍﻟﻤﺴﻴﺢ ﺍﻟﻤﻨﻘﻮﻟﺔ ﻣﻦ ﺍﻟﻠﺴﺎﻥ ﺍﻟﺴﺮﻳﺎﻧﻲ ﺍﻟﻰ ﻟﺴﺎﻥ ﺍﻟﻌﺮﺏ ﺑﺎﻣﺮ ﺍﻟﻤﺠﻤﻊ ﺍﻟﻤﻘﺪﺱ ﻟﺘﺒﺸﻴﺮ ﺍﻻﻣﻢ

* In the Repertory for Biblical and Eastern Literature. Pt. xv.

ܕܡܪܘܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܩܕܝܫ ܕܥܡ ܐܝܓܪܬܐ ܕܐܦܣܛܠܘܣ. Romæ typus S. Cong. de prop. f. 1703. fol.

The second part is, Novum Testamentum Syriacum et Arabicum. Tom. 2dus. Then, as in the first volume, the same words follow in Estrangelo. The full inscription on the next page is, Acta Apostolorum, Epistolæ Catholicæ ad usum Ecclesiæ nationis Maronitarum edita cum Apocalypsi D. Joannis: ܘܫܪܟܐ ܕܝܘܚܢܢ ܠܫܢ ܥܪܒܝ ܘܣܘܪܝܝ. The rest is, as in the first part, ܒܡܕܝܢܬ ܪܘܡܝ ܒܡܛܒܥܬ ܐܝܓܪܬ ܕܥܡ ܩܕܝܫ. Romæ typis Sacr. Cong. de prop. fide. A. 1703. fol.

The book has two columns, one of which contains the Peschito, the other the Arabic version in Syriac characters, commonly called the Karshuni text, therefore it is a Diglotton. The Peschito (for we shall speak of the Karshuni text in its place) is taken ex codice Bibliothecæ Collegii Maronitarum de urbe, quem Patriarcha Antiochiæ ejusdem nationis—cum permultis aliis Ecclesiasticarum rerum voluminibus transmiserat, &c. Faustus Naironus Banensis Maronita superintended the edition, who has given to us full information in the preface respecting the undertaking and its execution.

The Catholic Epistles follow the Acts of the Apostles, as is commonly the case in Syriac MSS.:—and are seven in number, of which the 2d of Peter, the 2d and 3d of John, and that of Jude, agree with Pocock's text except in some few readings. The Apocalypse is the same as De Dieu has given from Scaliger's MS.

The verses in Luke xxii. 17, 18, are marked with an asterisk at the beginning and at the end: the history of the Adulteress also is admitted with one asterisk at the beginning, and with another at the end. Neither the verse in Acts xxviii. 29. nor

We are soon convinced that this edition is not a mere impression from others, but that it is executed

to meet this part of his statements, it will perhaps be better first to say what MSS. &c. were used, and then to notice the readings referred to.

"The MSS. &c. were these—1. That brought by Dr. Buchanan from the Syrian Church in Travancore, now in the Public Library of this University, and bearing the class-marks OO. 1. 2.—2. A MS. also in the Public Library marked Ff. 2. 15. noticed in Ridley's Dissertatio de Syriacarum Novi Fœderis versionum indole, &c. p. 46. No. 14.—The collations of two very ancient MSS. of the Syriac Gospels published by Jones at Oxford, in 1805.—The collations found in the work of Ridley, just noticed, as also those of Wetstein and Schaaf.—The citations found in the works of Ephrem Syrus, and also those of a Syriac Lectionary lent to me by Dr. Adam Clarke. With the aid of these MSS. &c. continual reference being made to the other ancient versions, the Greek MSS. &c., those readings only were admitted which appeared to have an undoubted claim to preference. To classify so small a number of authorities as these seemed superfluous, especially as the MSS. if we except one only, viz. the Lectionary of Dr. A. Clarke, were all of the Jacobite or Monophysite communion.

"The passages cited by Dr. Hug, viz. Matt. xxvii. 35. Luke xxii. 17, 18. Acts viii. 37. xv. 34. xviii. 6. 1 John v. 7. 1 Cor. v. 8. Acts xx. 28. are either to be found at the foot of the page, have been expunged, or otherwise marked, as he has said. - - - -

- - - - - - - - - - - -

"The word ܕܐܝܬܝ placed in the lower margin at 1 Cor. v. 8. was not found in any of the MSS. collated, and, as other circumstances concurred in attaching suspicion to it, the other reading, viz. ܕܐܝܬܟ, which was found in the MSS., was put in its place. It is somewhat strange, that Dr. Hug should have supposed from this circumstance, that Nestorian MSS. had been used. If it could have proved any thing, surely it must have been that Nestorian MSS. were not used, as the reading preferred is manifestly Jacobite.

"On Heb. ii. 9., Dr. Hug says, 'the editor does not appear to have met with another reading (χωρις Θεου) accounted Nestorian in his MS.' Here Dr. Hug is again wrong in more points of view than one. In Schaaf we have, &c. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܒܟ ܒܟ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܕܐܝܬܝ Ipse enim *Deus per gratiam suam* pro omnibus, &c.; but in the edition in question we have, &c. ܕܐܝܬܝ ܒܟ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܕܐܝܬܝ. Ipse

from manuscript-documents. Matt. xxvii. 35. ἵνα πληρωθῇ——κλῆρον is placed in the under-margin with the remark in Syriac: "this addition is found in some Greek copies." Luke xxii. 17, 18. is included in brackets, and John vii. 53., viii. 12., bears the Syriac inscription, as in the English Polyglott: "This titular reading is not found in the Peschito." The words in Acts viii. 37. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Φιλιπ-

enim *per gratiam Dei*, &c. just as it is in the Greek, so that Χωρις Θεου, which he cites as being in this edition, and which he also says is Nestorian, is not found there. If you will take the trouble to turn to Schaaf's collations, printed at the end of his Syriac Testament, you will find that this reading occurs only in three editions of the Syriac Testament, and that it was the first introduced by Tremellius. Nor is it quite so obvious, as Dr. Hug seems to think, that it is a Nestorian reading. But further there is a variation of considerable moment in the reading introduced in this place, which it is rather extraordinary Dr. Hug should have overlooked, which has the authority of the MSS. collated by me, as well as that of the Greek to vouch for its accuracy.

"The reading in Acts xxviii. 28. ܐܝܬ ܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ *Church of God* occurs in the Travancore MS. noticed above, as also in a MS. collated by Adler (see Versiones Syr. p. 17.), and I had the good fortune to find it in another in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, marked Dawk. 23. The Vatican copy was written in the 11th century. The Travancore is perhaps 500 years old, and the Oxford copy appears to be much older. This edition too, was undertaken expressly for the Jacobites, who, it should seem, prefer this reading. It was on these accounts introduced in the text.

"With respect to the collations, which have not yet appeared, I can only say, that as I undertook and completed an edition of the Syriac old Testament; also, after collating several MSS. for the purpose, I postponed publishing them until I should be able to print the whole. But as a most valuable collection of Syriac MSS. has lately been deposited in the British Museum, I now feel disposed to wait a little longer, in order to add the riches there to be found to my former gleanings. The time and labour necessary for such a work will be great, and it is more than doubtful whether such an undertaking would not leave me to regret, that the fame to be acquired would all be but a poor recompense."

πος——Χριστον, and Acts xv. 34. ἐδοξε δε τῳ Σιλᾳ ἐπιμειναι αὐτὸν appear in the lower margin; also xviii. 6. το αἱμα ὑμων ἐπι την κεφαλην ὑμων is preceded by the remark: "these words are found in Greek books" as well as xxviii. 29. in the lower margin. The celebrated passage in 1 John v. 7. is wanting. A small note is pasted at the end of the book (in calce) which says, brevi prodibunt Codicum MSS. collationes, ad quorum fidem emendata est hæc editio. I do not know whether or when this has appeared. Probably the Syriac MSS. which Dr. Buchanan brought from the East Indies, and presented to the University of Cambridge, were the basis of the text[s]. Among these some are Nestorian, as it is evident from 1 Cor. v. 8.: in the lower margin stands the reading ܕܣܥܕ with the addition, "this is found in some copies." Adler found it in books, which, according to the subscription, belonged to the Nestorians (Novi Test. versiones Syriacæ l. i. p. 36.), and the Nestorians have the Ecclesiastical custom of persevering in a sacrament of leavened bread. Asseman. Bibl. Or. T. iii. P. ii. dissert. de Syris Nestorianis, § xii. The Editor does not appear to have met with another reading (Heb. ii. 9. χωρις Θεου) which is accounted Nestorian, in his MS. Besides the Nestorian, the MSS. of the Jacobites were also used. There is an evidence of this in Acts xx. 28., where all the hitherto known books of the Peschito read, THE CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH, but the editor received ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܥܕܬܐ into the text, with the remark below in the margin: "other copies in this place read OF THE MESSIAH." According to the testimony of Sabariesu, the received reading was

[s] The most recent inquiries into the present state of Christianity in Asia by Dr. C. Buchanan, translated by M. Chr. Gottl. Blumhardt. Stuttgart. 1813. P. 139—45.

the common one in the books of the Jacobites (Assem. Bibl. Or. T. iii. in Append. ad Catal. Ebed Jesu C. xxxix.) and is also found in the Philoxenian version. For it has something corresponding to the monophysitical confluence of both natures, in which the human merges into the divine, as into the ocean; on which account, God is said to do human actions, to sleep, to weep, and with his blood to redeem his people.

The existing editions are therefore from MSS. of three different ecclesiastical communities, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, and the Maronite. Each of these communities has indeed one or other of the readings, to which it gives a preference: but none of them possesses a particular recension of the text; neither the Nestorians, nor the Maronites: we however draw this conclusion in favour of the Eutychians, because the edition of the Bible Society, where peculiarities in the monophysitical text might have been distinguished, would have at least imparted them in the lower margin.

THE PHILOXENIAN VERSION.

SECTION LXX.

The MSS. of this version have a postscript after the Gospels, which furnishes us with information as to the time in which the version was made, and other historical circumstances relative to it. As far as it relates to matter, the postscript is of the same import in the very many MSS. which have been carefully examined, and in different copies only varies more or less in some phrases. Thus far, it is ver-

bally the same: THIS BOOK OF THE FOUR EVANGELISTS WAS WITH GREAT PAINS TRANSLATED FROM GREEK INTO SYRIAC FIRST AT MABUG, IN THE YEAR OF ALEXANDER 819, IN THE DAYS OF THE HOLY CONFESSOR PHILOXENUS, BISHOP OF THAT PLACE. IT WAS AFTERWARDS VERY CAREFULLY COLLATED BY ME, THE POOR [h] THOMAS, WITH TWO *(some read three)* GREEK MSS., VERY EXCELLENT AND CORRECT COPIES, IN THE ANTONIA OF THE GREAT CITY ALEXANDRIA, IN THE SACRED MONASTERY OF THE ANTONIANS: FOR IT WAS TWICE WRITTEN AND COLLATED IN THIS PLACE, ANNO 927 OF ALEXANDER, IN THE FOURTH INDICTION [i].

The translation was therefore made in the days of Philoxenus, or A′ 508 of the Christian æra. This Philoxenus, or Xenaias, presided over the bishoprick of Mabug, Manbej, Mangeb, or Hierapolis in Syria from the year 488 to 518 [k]. In this postscript the translator of the version is not named, but another Syriac writer has preserved his memory. According to him, it was Polycarp, a Chorepiscopus of Philoxenus, who undertook the labour, and dedicated it to Philoxenus, who had summoned him to the office, and from whom the version received its name [l]. It was made from the Greek, and contains the whole New Testament.

[h] *Dem armen.* ⲧⲱⲙⲁⲥ.—TRANSLATOR.

[i] Adler Novi Test. Versiones Syriacæ—denuo examinatæ, Hafniæ 1789. 4. l. ii. p. 45—8. Repert. of Bibl. and Or. Lit. vii. Pt. p. 234, viii. Pt. p. 89—90. Storr Obss. super versionibus Novi Test. Syr. P. ii. § 19. p. 45.

[k] Assemani Bibl. Or. T. ii. p. 10—46.

[l] Moses Aghelæus apud Assem. Bib. Or. T. ii. p. 83. Adler [illegible] cit. 48.

SECTION LXXI.

PHILOXENUS, called also Xenaias, was a favourite of Peter Gnaphey, who had forced himself into the Patriarchate of Antioch, and knew how to maintain himself in this exalted post, by means of the connexions which he had, and the creatures, with whom he surrounded himself. Among the latter was Philoxenus, whom he consecrated Bishop of Mabug, and used as a tool. The Patriarch was attached to the doctrines of Eutychius, and as he appeared somewhat to modify the dogmata of the Monophysites, a great part of Syria came over to him. He indeed found opponents, for generally such a change could not take place without great commotion; yet, the court at Constantinople seemed to favour him and his opinion so much, that the Emperor Zeno published on the subject a proposition of union or a Henoticon, which the Monophysites, received with approbation, and to which the Patriarch, with Philoxenus and his party, and Peter Mongus, Patriarch of Alexandria, subscribed. From this time they constituted one individual sect, which was attached to the New doctrine[m]. This, as it appears, occasioned them to resolve upon a Church-version of their own, which, for the sake of imparting to it every possible advantage with regard to the text, they executed (as I conjecture) after the copies of Origen.

[m] Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. T. ii. p. 10—46. Evagrius, H. E. L. iii. c. 31. 52.

SECTION LXXII.

A HUNDRED and eight years afterwards, viz. in the year 927 of the Greeks, or 616 of our era, the poor Thomas, as the postscript after the Gospels declares, bestowed renewed diligence on this church-document of the Monophysites, and collated it with two (or as some MSS. say, with three) old MSS. in the monastery of the Antonians at Alexandria.

He collated the Acts of the Apostles, and the Catholic Epistles, as the subscription after them avers, with a Greek MS. He, however, appears to have collated Paul with two; for this number is quoted on the margin of his Epistles [a].

Several transcripts of this version call this poor Thomas, Thomas of Charkel, (in the subscriptions which the transcribers have added) like the Parisian Codex: "Thus ends with God's help, the holy book of the discourses of the adored Christ our God, according to the four Evangelists, from the Charkelian emendation," &c. And under the catalogue of chapters in Matthew: "Thus end the chapters of Matthew, seventy in number, after the correction and emendation of Thomas of Charkel." Other MSS. have several other subscriptions of this sort [b].

We are, however, in less difficulty about the person of Thomas, than about another circumstance relative to his labours. For he says in the postscript after the Gospels: "it was afterwards very carefully col-

[a] Wetstein, Proleg. in Nov. Test. P. i. p. 112—13.

[b] Adler, Vers. Nov. Test. Syr. denuo exam. l. ii. p. 56. 58. 59. 63. 66., &c.

lated by me, the poor Thomas, ... it was twice written and collated in this place," &c. Hence some would conclude, that a double collation of it took place, that the first was by Thomas, and the second by some unknown individual, in the year of Alexander 927.

Yet it is not unusual for a person to collate one MS. twice, nor was it so among the ancients; Thomas may twice have done this; and it is evident that the second collation A' 927. is the work of no one but Thomas of Charkel. Thus Bar Hebræus informs us in his Syriac Chronicon: "At this period (says he), ad Ann' 927. of the æra of the Seleucidæ, lived Thomas of Charkel, a Monk of the monastery of Tarill, who in his youth applied himself to Greek literature in the monastery of Kenserin, and was afterwards Bishop of Mabug: when he was banished from thence by Domitian, Bishop of Melito, he went to Egypt, and dwelt in the Antonia of Alexandria, in the monastery of the Antonians, where, with praise-worthy diligence, he restored the four Gospels, and other books of the New Testament, by means of a careful and accurate revision, of which Philoxenus had before caused a version to be made at Mabug." Thus far, Bar Hebræus [p].

Thomas was, therefore, a cotemporary of Paul of Tela, who in the same place executed a Syriac version of the Old Testament from the Hexaplar text of Origen. From this circumstance, I explain to my own mind the undertaking of Thomas of Charkel, which yet continues to have something singular in it.

[p] Asseman. Bib. Or. P. ii. p. 334. Eichhorn in Repert. Bibl. and Or. Lit. vii. P. § 234. Bruns, *ibidem*, viii. Pt. p. 89. 90. Probably the passage is in the second part not yet printed, which contains the history of the Patriarchs of Antioch.

SECTION LXXIII.

For Thomas saw the Hexaplar text, from which Paul performed his labours, every where accompanied on the margin with the readings of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. The church-version of the New Testament in his Communion, appeared to him to want this rich supply, whilst the Library of the Antonians offered to him MSS., which remarkably varied from others in old and striking readings. He now conceived that he might be able to make use of these materials, as the books of Aquila and others on the Old Testament were there, and as the books of the Antonians furnished him with as many and far greater variations, with which he might occupy the margin :—instead of the Hebrew text, the former of the old Syriac versions served him for the purposes of collation. And, as exegetical remarks were occasionally scattered over the margin, he was anxious not to be deficient in the like, and therefore added from his own learned resources all that he had to give and could give.

The readings, which he has communicated to us on the margin, occur in the books B.C.; yet they are mostly such as are found in D. from the period of the unrevised text, as well as in the Sahidic and Latin versions before Jerome. In the Acts of the Apostles, we are chiefly acquainted with considerable variations of a confused text, which often agree with D. and E., but sometimes are more extravagant than in either of them. Cf. Acts xiii. 33. xiv. 4. 5. xiv. 10. xv. 1. xvi. 17, &c.

SECTION LXXIV.

Now, if we were satisfied that he communicated to us in the margin only, the peculiarities which he discovered in his old MSS., his labours would deserve our utmost thanks; but he was not so cautious and unpretending: he wished to become a critic, and occasionally inserted his readings into the text, where he made use of obeli and asterisks, according to the plan of the Hexapla, which his fellow-labourer translated into Syriac. Hereby, in many passages, he destroyed the original reading of the Philoxenian version, the text of which is probably worth more than all the critical additaments, with which he was desirous of decorating it.

But we must not believe, that he was the first who introduced obeli and asterisks into the Philoxenian text; they were of an earlier date, and were originally in it. Good luck has preserved to us a MS. of this version, which has neither the subscription of Thomas, nor the various readings in the margin, which he collected from the ancient copies, nor the remarks, which he made according to the best of his judgment. This Codex (Mediceo-Florentin. Plut. 1. n. xl.) is consequently a transcript of a book, which existed before Thomas's labours[q]; and is of no common value, in enabling us to separate the interpolations which he inserted from the version of Polycarp.

Since then this Codex also is furnished with obeli and asterisks, we readily perceive, that the use of them

[q] Adler, versiones N. T. Syr. denuo ex. l. ii. p. 52—55.

goes as far back as Polycarp, the author of the version. Either he himself added them, to correct certain passages of the text by means of them, or he chose a text which, on account of its correctness, already stood in estimation and regard. In the last case, we might conclude in favour of Origen's text, who executed his critical corrections by means of obeli and asterisks, the common Alexandrine marks. If any family of MSS., exhibiting this text, were brought to light, we might then be assured, that Polycarp did not form his text, but chose an existing recension, after which he prepared his version. Then, the conclusion in favour of Origen's text would be pretty certain.

SECTION LXXV.

THOMAS, as we have said, did not content himself with placing his readings and observations in the margin, but had the unfortunate propensity, to undertake even critical improvements. This is clearly verified, in Mark xi. 10., where after πατρος ἡμων Δαβιδ, he has inserted with an asterisk, the words, εἰρηνη και δοξα ἐν ὑψιστοις, and thus explains himself in the margin. "THIS IS NOT FOUND IN ALL GREEK MSS., NOT EVEN IN THE TEXT OF MAR XENAIAS, BUT IT IS FOUND IN SOME, WHICH WE ACCOUNT VERY GOOD COPIES." The passage was, therefore, decisively not in the Philoxenian text, and first was introduced by this critic. His interpolations also are betrayed by the readings; for they are of the description found in no other books, but those of the confused Alexandrine text, such as the MSS. of the Antonians were: *e. g.* Luke xix. 45., after ἀγοραζοντας, —και τας τραπεζας των κολλυβιστων ἐξεχεεν, και τ[redacted]

καθεδρας των πολουντων τας περιστερας is inserted with an asterisk, which of all the Greek MSS. appears only in D. He informs us in the margin, that these words are not to be discovered in all Greek books. Who cannot perceive, that in Acts xv. 11. συγκατατεθεμενων δε των πρεσβυτερων, τοις ὑπο του Πετρου εἰρημενοις, ἐσιγησεν, which with an asterisk he introduces after ὁν τροπον κακεινοι, is taken from an unrevised text, particularly, as we again meet with it in Codex D?

He took other improvements (at least he deemed them such) from the Peschito. In Matt. xv. 1. D. and the Peschito add και της νυμφης after του νυμφιου. This addition appears in the Philoxenian text with an asterisk, and the marginal observation, "THIS IS NOT FOUND IN EVERY MSS., *viz.* NOT IN THOSE OF THE ALEXANDRINES[r]." He might, therefore, have borrowed it only from the Peschito. The phrase το πῦρ * αὐτῶν, Mark ix. 48. has yet been found in no MS.: the Peschito alone has this αὐτῶν: whence otherwise then could it have originated? After διωκεις, Acts ix. 5., he adds with an asterisk the words, σκληρον σοι προς κεντρα λακτιζειν, but he says in the margin, "THESE WORDS DO NOT OCCUR IN THIS PLACE, IN THE GREEK, BUT WHERE PAUL MAKES MENTION OF HIMSELF." What we do not here find in the Greek, we literally find in the Peschito, which therefore is the source of the addition.

To separate what he has added, and to bring back Polycarp's text to its former state, we must, above all things, examine and collate the above-mentioned Medicéan Codex.

[r] According to another reading, "IN THE ALEXANDRINE."

SECTION LXXVI.

YET, the corruption, which Thomas has occasioned in some passages, does not totally prevent us from forming a general idea of the text, which Polycarp expressed. In the first place, as far as it concerns the Gospels, we remark, that in greater readings, such as Matt. vi. 13., xx. 22., Mark vi. 11., xiii. 14., Luke iv. 18., x. 22., John i. 27., v. 16., vi. 22. and 69., which we have shown to be peculiarities in Lucian's text when collated with the Egyptian books, (§ 38.) they entirely agree with Lucian. But, in smaller readings, they are frequently remote from Lucian's text, and approach the Egyptian readings, especially when the MSS. A. K. M. 42. 114. 116. and Matt. 10. coincide with the Egyptian books. Yet even in peculiarities, where the MSS. A. K. M., &c. stand alone, the text of Polycarp is in their favour, of which (§ 39.) we have already produced examples.

In the Acts of the Apostles is one of the most extraordinary readings (xx. 28.) which distinguishes Lucian's and the Egyptian books: the first read *την εκκλησιαν Κυριου και Θεου*; but the Egyptian A.C. 40. Vat. 367. DE, Copt. Sahid. *Κυριου*, from which B in this instance separates itself, and reads *Θεου*, in which it is accompanied by some MSS. Polycarp has this third reading in his text. Otherwise, he constantly inclines at one time to the Egyptian, and at another to Lucian's side. An example of this agreement of Polycarp, or if we prefer it, of the Philoxenian text may be seen in Acts x.—the letter *p* marks, where it stands.

p. 2. τοιων ἐλεημ..	ABC. 40. E. Copt. Sah.	τοιων τε ἐλεημ..
p. 5. ἀνδρας εἰς Ἰοππην	AB. 1. E. Copt. Sah.	εἰς Ἰοππην ἀνδρας
Σιμωνα τινα		p. Σιμωνα τον
ὃς ἐπικαλειται	AB. 1. Copt.	ἐπικαλουμενον
7. λαλων αὐτῳ	ABC. 1. 40. 367.	p. λαλων τῳ Κορνηλιῳ
οἰκετων	ABC. 40.	p. οἰκετων αὐτου
10. αὐτων ἐγενετο	ABC. 40. 1. Copt.	p. ἐκεινων ἐπεπεσεν
p. 11. καταβαινον	ABC. 1. 40. E. Sah.	καταβαινον ἐπ' αὐτον
ἀρχαις καθιεμενον	ABC. 40. E.	p. ἀρχαις δεδεμενον και καθιεμενον
12. τετραποδα, και ἑρπετα της γης	ABC. 40. 1. Copt. Sah.	p. τετραποδα της γης, και τα θηρια, και τα ἑρπετα
p. 14. και ἀκαθαρτον	AB. 1. Sah.	ἡ ἀκαθαρτον
16. και εὐθυς *	ABC. 40. E. Copt.	p. και παλιν
p. 23. ἐπαυριον ἀναστας	ABC. 40. 1. D. Copt. Sah.	ἐπαυριον
(ὁ Πετρος is wanting)	AB. 40. D. Copt.	p. ὁ Πετρος
p. 24. τῃ δε ἐπαυρ..	ABC. 40. 1. DE. Copt. Sah.	και τῃ ἐπαυρ....
p. 26. ἐγειρεν αὐτον	ABC. 1. 40. DE. Copt. Sah.	αὐτον ἐγειρε
30. ἡμην και	ABC. Copt.	p. ἡμην νηστευων και
την ἐννατην	ABC. 40. 1. D.	p. την ἐννατην ὡραν
p. 33. ὑπο του Κυριου	ABC. 40. Copt.	ὑπο του Θεου
p. 34. στομα αὐτῶν	ABC. E. Copt. Sah.	στομα
36. τον λογον ἀπεστειλε	ABC. Copt. Sah.	p. τον λογον, ὀν ἀπεστειλε
p. 47. δυναται κωλυσαι	ABC. 40. 1. Copt. Sah.	κωλυσαι δυναται
p. 48. ἐν τῳ ὀνοματι Ἰησου χριστου βαπτισθηναι	AB. 40. 1. Copt. Sah.	βαπτισθηναι ἐν τῳ ὀνοματι Κυριου.

According to my judgment, Polycarp did not so much adhere to Egyptian readings, in Paul's Epistles, as in the Catholic Epistles, and the Acts of the Apostles. I select Galat. iii. and iv., for the sake of adducing some exemplification of it also.

CHAPTER III.

1. ἐβασκανε··οἰς	ABC. 17. Copt.	p. ἐβασκανε τῃ ἀληθειᾳ μη πειθεσθαι, οἰς
προεγρ··ἐσταυρωμενος	ABC. 17. Copt.	p. προεγρ..ἐν ὑμιν ἐσταυρωμενος
p. 10. ὁτι ἐπικαταρατος	ABC. 17. Copt.	ἐπικαταρατος
p. 12. ποιησας αὐτα	ABC. 17. Copt.	ποιησας αὐτα ἀνθρωπος
13. ὁτι γεγραπται	AB. 17.	p. γεγραπται γαρ
17. Θεου, ὁ	ABC. 27. Copt.	p. Θεου εἰς Χριστον, ὁ
p. τετρακοσια και τριακοντα ἐτη	ABC. Copt.	ἐτη τετρακοσια και τριακοντα.

CHAPTER IV.

6. καρδ··ἡμων	AC. Copt.	p. καρδ..ὑμων
7. δια Θεου	AB. 17. Copt.	p. Θεου δια Χριστου
8. φυσει μη	ABC. 17. Copt.	p. μη φυσει
14. πειρασμον ὑμων	AB. 17. Copt.	p. πειρασμον μου
15. που οὐν	ABC. 17. Copt.	p. τις οὐν
p. 25. δουλευει γαρ	ABC. 17. Copt.	δουλευει δε
26. μητηρ ἡμων	BC. Copt.	p. μητηρ παντων ἡμων.

From the Catholic Epistles we select 1 John, Ch. ii.

4. ὁτι ἐγνωκα	AB. Copt.	p. ἐγνωκα
6. αὐτος περιπατειν	AB.	p. αὐτος οὐτω περιπατειν
p. 7. ἀγαπητοι	ABC. Copt.	ἀδελφοι
p. ὁν ἠκουσατε	ABC. 27. Copt.	ὁν ἠκουσατε ἀπ' ἀρχης
10. οὐκ ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῳ	AC. Copt.	p. ἐν αὐτῳ οὐκ ἐστιν
p. 13. ἐγραψα ὑμιν παιδ..	ABC. Copt.	γραφω ὑμιν παιδ··
15. του Θεου ἐν αὐτῳ	AC. Copt.	p. του πατρος ἐν αὐτῳ
p. 23. ὁ ὁμολογων τον υἱον και τον πατερα ἐχει	ABC. Copt.	
p. 24. ὑμεις, ὁ	ABC. Copt.	ὑμεις οὐν
27. μενει ἐν ὑμιν	ABC. Copt.	p. ἐν ὑμιν μενει
29. ὁτι και πας	AC.	p. ὁτι πας.

The most perfect copy of this version, now known, viz. that of Gloucester Ridley, now in the Library of

New College in Oxford, has not the Apocalypse. Yet, as it seems, we have no reason to lament the loss, since De Dieu, with the omission indeed of the critical points, had long before edited it. § 64. These points, which the MS. contains, the mode of translation, entirely after the manner of Polycarp, the condition of the text, which confines itself neither to the readings of Lucian or Hesychius, but rapidly hurries from the one to the other, are so many evidences, in confirmation of our hypothesis.

In the Gospels we have indeed Greek MSS., to the side of which the Philoxenian version inclines, but this is not the case in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. If Polycarp selected himself the text of Origen for translation, it could not well be otherwise, than that some MSS. of the Acts and of the Epistles should agree with him according to this recension, were Polycarp's text in these parts of the New Testament never so unique. The objection, which I here have opposed to it, is not devoid of force: yet is it considerably weakened, if we take into the account, that by far not so many MSS. of the Acts and of the Epistles were collated, as of the Gospels, and that a great proportion of these was only carelessly and superficially collated. Much preliminary matter is wanting to enable us accurately and with confidence to pass a decision on these and other critical questions.

SECTION LXXVII.

The version itself betrays the most careful and laborious efforts to lose no syllable of the original text, and to express each of the minutiæ, though even in violation of the Syriac idiom. Ὁ, ἡ, τὸ are in general

very carefully rendered, as well as ἐστι and εἰσι, little as the one or the other is reconcileable with pure Syriac phraseology. So, αὐτος, αὐτη does not according to the custom of the Syrians appear as an affix, but is treated as a word of itself, by means of the syllable ܗܘ, to which it is joined. The words compounded with προ, συν, ἐπι, κατα, which all the Semitical dialects do not recognize, are produced in an artificial manner, quite contrary to good taste, as *e. g.* προθεσις, ܣܝܡ ܩܕܡ, ἐπιγραφη, ܟܬܒܐ ܥܠ Mark ii. 26., xii. 16. However, these misadaptations, with which we occasionally meet, in which the original language is misapplied, are of uncommon use for critical purposes, since the version seldom leaves us in doubt, as to that which must have existed in the original document, as is the case in other versions, the authors of which have gone more freely to work.

SECTION LXXVIII.

The four Gospels of this version were printed in England with the following title. Sacrorum Evangeliorum Versio Syriaca Philoxeniana, ex Codd. MSS. Ridleianis in Bibliothecâ Collegii Novi Oxoniensis repositis, nunc primum edita, cum interpretatione et annotationibus Josephi White, A.M. Coll. Wadh. Socii, et linguæ Arabicæ Prof. Laudian. Oxonii, è typograph. Clarendonianâ. 1778. 4. This volume is divided into two divisions: Tom ii. begins with the Gospel of John. The second has this title, Actuum Apostolorum et Epistolarum tàm Catholicarum quàm Paulinarum Versio Syriaca Philoxeniana ex Codice MS. Ridleiano in Bibl. Coll. Nov. Oxon. reposito nunc primùm edita, cum inter-

pretatione et adnotationibus Josephi White, S.T.P. Ling. Arab. apud Oxonienses Prof. Tom. 1. Actus Apostolorum et Epistolas Catholicas complectens Oxonii è Typogr. Clarendon. 1799. The second division includes Paul with the same title, Tom. ii. Epistolas Paulinas complectens. Oxon., &c. 1803. Several scholars have given accounts and descriptions of the MSS. from which they are taken [s], as well as monographs and tractatus on the state and readings of the text [t].

PALÆSTINO-SYRIAC VERSION.

SECTION LXXIX.

We are as yet acquainted with one single MS. of it, which only contains lessons from the four Gospels for all the Sundays and festivals in the year. It is among the Syriac MSS. of the Vatican, Number xix. whence 1. George Christian Adler drew it forth, and undertook to edit it [u].

Both the characters and language, in which it is written, differ somewhat from the common Syriac. It has many Chaldee expressions, and in its grammatical arrangement approaches very near to this

[s] Glocester Ridley de Syriacarum N. T. versionum indole atque usû. Londini 1761. Adler, Novi Test. versiones Syriacæ, Simplex, Philoxeniana, Hierosolymitana, denuò examinatæ. Hafniæ, 1789. 4. Paulus,—Accuratior MSS^rum., quibus versio N. V. Philoxeniana continetur, catalogus, cum quibusdam ad viros eruditos quæstionibus. Helmstadii. 1778.

[t] Gottlob Christ. Storr Obss. super N. T. versionibus Syriacis. Stuttgardiæ, 1772—8. Storr in Repert. Bibl. et Or. Lit. Part x.

[u] Nov. Test. versiones Syr. Simplex, Philoxeniana, et Hierosolymitana denuò examinatæ. L. iii. p. 137.

dialect, as *e. g.* in the affixes of the third person after nouns of the plural number, in their *status emphaticus*, and the formation of the third person masculine in the future tense.

Abu'lfaraj distinguishes three dialects of the Syriac, the Syro-Aramaic, which is the most elegant, of which the inhabitants of Roha and Haran and the exterior of Syria make use; the Palæstinian, which is spoken at Damascus, on Libanus, and the interior of Syria, and the Chaldæo-Nabathæan, the most crude of all, which is common in the Assyrian mountains, and the villages of Irak [x].

The manifest proximity to the Chaldee, which is noticed in our version, appears so to characterize its dialect, that it has been accounted to be the Chaldæo-Nabathæan. According to appearance, the Peschito was composed in the country of Edessa, Roha, Haran, &c., and, as we know, was there the Church-version. Abu'lfaraj likewise informs us, that it was principally used in the east of Syria [y]. From its country, it is written in the first and purest dialect. The Philoxenian prevailed in the neighbourhood of Antioch, and makes us acquainted with the language of this part of Syria. Therefore Damascus and Palæstine, or the Assyrian Mountains and the district of Irak alone remain to us for this version.

To determine our choice of these two, we must not overlook the observation, which the Scholar has made, to whom we are peculiarly indebted for the knowledge of this version, viz. that in it many expressions occur, which are only used in the Philoxenian. As then both these idioms come in contact, so also must their native land come in contact.

[x] Hist. Dynast. Dyn. i. p. 16, 17.
[y] Dyn. vi. p. 100.

That part of Syria, in which our version originated, was evidently a Roman province, or belonged to one. I deduce this from some words in the specimen printed by Adler, Matt. xxvii. 3—32. In Matt. xxvii. 27. the soldiers were plainly called ܪܘܡܝܐ, ROMANS; as if in this country no other soldiers but Romans were known. In the same verse, also, στρατα is rendered by the Roman expression ܩܣܛܪܘܢ, *castrum*; but if the garrison was called *castrum*, we may easily divine, to whom the government of the land belonged. The Assyrian Mountains never had a Roman Prætor, and were not reduced *in formam Provinciæ*, as was the fate of Western Syria and Palæstine. We therefore certainly rather have here a Palæstinian version before us, than one from the Assyrian Mountains. Michaelis and others on his suggestion even called it the Jerusalem version.

The MS. itself was written at Antioch in the vicinity of Palestine, where the Monks of Palæstine might easily have had a monastery. The subscription says, that it was written "IN THE MONASTERY OF THE ABBOT MOSES, IN THE CITY OF ANTIOCH, IN THE VICINITY OF THE HOLY LAND." Probably, ܕܒܫܡ ܐܢܛܘܟ should be ܕܒܫܡ ܐܢܛܘܟ.

SECTION LXXX.

THE version itself was made from the Greek text, as is evident from the Greek orthography of proper names, (*e. g.* Ἰησους, Ἰωαννης, Καϊαφας, Ἰαειρος, Ἀννας, Μεσσια,) and from the multitude of Greek expressions, which are retained in the same places, where they appear in the original text:—*e. g.* τραπεζιται, Matt. xxv. 27. ἀντιδικος, Matt. v. 2. βουλευτης, xv. 43.

των κεραμων, Luke v. 19.—or και γαρ, Joh. iv. 23. μαλλον—ἡ γαρ, Joh. iii. 19., &c.

Yet, to which side the Greek text, which the translator had before him, inclines, and with which family of MSS. it coincides, we cannot decide, since we have no entire collation of it: only two or three rarer readings as yet are extracted from each chapter, and introduced to public notice. We therefore observe its peculiarities, which occur in every MS., to whatever recension it may belong, without knowing to what MSS. it is related, as a whole.

Its text however seems to have been compiled from different documents; *e. g.* in Matt. xiv. 24. (where for ηδη μεσον της θαλασσης, some MSS. and the Peschito read σταδιους πολλους απο της γης απειχε), it combines both readings, σταδ. πολλ. απο της γης απειχε μεσον της θαλασσης. Or, in John xix. 16, 17., where for παρελαβον τον Ιη, &c., it likewise compounds αγαγοντες δε τον Ιησουν επεθηκαν αυτω τον σταυρον αυτου, και βαστα̃ζων εξηλθεν····the individual readings of which are dispersed in different MSS.

THE PERSIAN VERSION.

SECTION LXXXI.

THE Persian version, which appears in the London Polyglott, only comprehends the four Gospels. The language also is admixed with so many Arabic expressions, that the times after Mohammed, and the influence which his religion had on the language of the people, are not easily to be mistaken in it.

The boundaries of Persia nearest to the northern part of Mesopotamia made use, as it seems, of

Syriac ceremonies, and even of this Church-version, which is probable, since we have both in Latin. Edessa was still much frequented by the Persians in the 5th and 6th century, for the sake of receiving from this renowned school instruction in the genuine Nestorian doctrines [a]. When, therefore, these parts of Persia wished a version in their own tongue, they had recourse to the Syriac copies, and began to translate from them. Hence arose our present Persian version, which was probably composed at Edessa.

SECTION LXXXII.

Its source is the Peschito, as many readings prove, which are still only to be seen in it and the Persian version. Thus, in Mark vi. 41. ἐμερισαν πασι; 51. ἐθαυμαζον και ἐξισταντο:—vii. 2. wants κοιναις and τουτ' ἐστιν; 20. ὁ δε for ἐλεγε δε; 31. εἰς τα ὁρια for ἀνα μεσον των ὁριων; 34 wants ὁ ἐστι, διανοιχθητι; viii. 25. wants και ἐποιησεν αὐτον ἀναβλεψαι; ix. 26. και το δαιμονιον κραξαν; 29. ἐν νηστειᾳ και προσευχῃ; x. 19. μη κλεψῃς, μη φονευσῃς; 26. Τιμαιος υἱος Τιμαιου, 52. ἠκολουθει ἐν τῃ ὁδῳ. So many examples occur to us in so few chapters, that it is unnecessary to illustrate the subject farther.

Many blunders of the translator, which evidently arose from the Syriac, also demonstrate this. In Mark vi. 9. the Persian translates ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμενους σανδαλια, كفش را دشمن دارند, "*they hated shoes or sandals*," which arose from mistaking the root ,ܣܢ

[a] Theodor. Lector. ἐκλογαι ἀπο του δευτερου βιβλιου. Assem. Bibl. Or. Tom. iii. c. 2. p. 744.

to provide with shoes, for ܣܢܐ, *to hate*, ; in Mark vii. 11. the Peschito renders δωρον μου, ὁ ἐαν ἐξ ἐμου ὠφεληθης, , where he mistook the word for , and translated it, *draw ye near to me.* In Mark vii. 34. *he looked towards heaven, and sighed*, ; here, the derivation from the root ܫܪܐ deceived the translator, and he interpreted it, *he looked towards heaven, and reposed.* He makes the same mistake in Mark viii. 12. where he translates, *and he took rest*, or *repose in his spirit*, and in Mark ix. 3. οὐ δυναται λευκαναι— in the Peschito; where in the two senses of ܚܙܐ "*he saw*," and in Aphel "*he made white*," he mistook the one for the other, "*that they could not bear the sight.*" The word βασιλικος in John v. 49., which the Syrian rendered ܒܪ ܡܠܟܐ, he conceived to be a proper name, and translated it, *so spake to him* ABD'ELMELEK.

SECTION LXXXIII.

THIS version would be of uncommon value in criticising the Peschito, if we had it in an uncorrupted state, but it is disfigured by many glosses: *e. g.* Mark vii. 15., after the words, *this is that which defiles the man*, is added, *which is a deadly sin;* in Mark vii. 26. where mention is made of the Greek woman from Syrophœnicia, the gloss is inserted, *for she was from Hems.* In almost every chapter we meet with similar additions and glosses. Or, where these do not occur, we find words and passages twice translated; in Mark vi. 49. the word φαντασμα is once translated ظُرُوغ, *a deception*, and afterwards, خيال, *a phantom.* Mark viii. 14. The Peschito translates,

they had only one loaf with them in the ship—ONLY ONE CAKE; the Persian follows it, and first says *one cake* قرص, translating the word afterwards *bread* نان— *they had not one cake, and no bread with them in the ship*. Cf. Mark vi. 7. 31. 43.

The one of these readings frequently expresses the Syriac, the other the Greek text, as is the case in the last example: yet have I no reason to suppose, that so many Greek grammars and MSS. were in circulation in Persia, that the readers could have had the opportunity of illustrating and improving the text by their means. It is far more probable, that one Persian version existed from the Greek, which readers and transcribers frequently quoted in their collations, from whence these interpolations arose. This vast empire, indeed, must have had several versions to supply the wants of different provinces, in which different dialects prevailed. If gain be unable to stimulate us to that, which the study of the Bible, from a careful examination of this document, may perhaps promote; yet, the striking and decided relationship of the Persian to our native German, should summon us to devote to the former a more particular attention, for the sake of unfolding from it the original construction of our own tongue, its roots, and most ancient senses, and also for the sake of reflecting light on data in the history of the world, with respect to the origin and migrations of the people.

SECTION LXXXIV.

Besides the version in the Polyglott, there is still another which Whelock edited, with which, however, we are but little acquainted. It has two titles: the first is—Quatuor Evangelia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Persicè, ad numerum situmque verborum Latinè data 1652; and that of the second is—Quatuor Evangeliorum Domini nostri Jesu Christi versio Persica, Syriacam et Arabicam suavissimè redolens, ad verba et mentem Græci textûs fideliter et venustè concinnata. Londini. 1657.

The editors might certainly have had a MS. which contained a version from the Greek; but they have confounded them all together, and appealed to the Syro-Persian text in the formation of their own. For they used for this purpose Pocock's MS., from which the text of the English Polyglott was printed, as Pierson himself confesses in the preface to Whelock's Gospels. Cum Evangeliis Persicis edendis D. Abraham Whelocus operam navâsset, tres sibi MSS. Codices impetraverat, Oxoniensem, Cantabrigiensem, et alterum Pocockianum, quorum uno descripto, cæteris collatis, fusiorem in omnes commentarium designaverat[a]. If they had given to us in a pure state that version, which was framed *ad verba et mentem Græci textûs*, it might have indeed bestowed upon them that sweet Syriac and Arabic perfume which they extol in the title-page.

Finally, Nadir Shah caused a Persian version to

[a] Herbert Marsh's Rem. and Add. to Michaelis's Introduction. P. 1. German Translation, pp. 210, 211.

be made from Greek, Arabic, Syriac, Armenian, and Hebrew MSS., which is said to have been edited at Ispahan, 1740-41. The criticism of the New Testament can, indeed, be but little occupied with this.

ARMENIAN VERSION.

SECTION LXXXV.

The history of this version is known from two sources, from an Armenian Biography of the Saints in the Bibliotheque du Roi at Paris, from whence the Bishop of Erivan translated the life of Mesrob into Latin, as a specimen. On this Richard Simon employed himself[b]. The other is the Armenian history of Moses Chorenensis, which Whiston's son edited with the title, Mosis Chorenensis Historiæ Armeniacæ, libri iii. Armeniacè ediderunt, Latinè verterunt Gulielmus et Georgius Gul. Whistonii filii, Aulæ Clarensis in Academiâ Cantabrigiensi aliquamdiù alumni. Londini. 1736-4. Michaelis employed himself on this beautiful document. Neither differ in the main points.

SECTION LXXXVI.

The version is cotemporary with the alphabet of he nation. The invention of this has made the memory of Mesrob from Hasekos, in the province of Taran, immortal among his countrymen. Before his ime, they made use of the Syriac letters, and, as it

[b] Histoire critique des versions du N. T. Ch. 17. p. 203. 205.

seems, the Syriac Bible and Liturgies in their religious services. The want of a national character occupied his mind in an uncommon manner, and after several unsuccessful attempts, it is said to have been revealed to him by a vision from heaven.

He hastened to impart his new alphabet to King Uram Scavu, and to Isaac, the Patriarch of the land, who caused schools to be established in Armenia, in which reading and writing were taught. With this view Mesrob even travelled to Iberia.

On his return, he found the Patriarch busy in applying it to translations from the Syriac. Then no Greek MSS. were to be found, because Meruzan, a Persian Deputy, had commanded all Greek books to be burned, and the Persians in general tolerated among the Armenians no other language and character (probably, for the Church-use) than the Syriac [c].

When the Ephesian Synod assembled, in the year 431, two pupils of Mesrob, Joseph and Eznak, were sent to communicate the proceedings of this assembly, and a carefully written copy of the Bible.

Isaac and Mesrob now threw away their translations from the Syriac, and commenced their labour afresh from the newly acquired Greek copy: but for this they wanted a sufficient knowledge of the Greek language [d].

All this was unable to weary them: Joseph and Eznak were sent to Alexandria, to perfect themselves in Greek; and for the third time, they now went to work, assisted also by Moses Chorenensis, the historian [e].

[c] Moses Chorenens. Hist. Arm. l. iii. c. 54. Rich. Simon. Hist. crit. des versions du N. T. 17. Ch.

[d] Moses Chor. L. iii. c. 61. Mesrob's pupils on this occasion were called Johannes Ecclensis and Josephus Planensis.

[e] Moses Chor. loc. cit. Richard Simon Hist. des vers. loc. cit.

to the Ægyptian recension, but not so closely as not to have adopted readings from those books, which were read before the introduction of a recension into Alexandria. It frequently accords with Codex D in readings peculiar to it alone, or with the MSS., which Thomas of Charkel collated in the monastery of the Antonians. Thus, in Matt. xv. 32. ἡμεραι τρεις εἰσι και προσμεν xviii. 33. οὐκ ἐδει οὐν και σε. xix. 10. ἡ αἰτια του ἀνδρος. Mark ii. 9. τον κραββατον, και ὑπαγε εἰς τον οἰκον σου. ii. 26. ἐφαγεν, και ἐδωκε και τοις συν αὐτῳ οὐσι, οὐς οὐκ ἐξεστι ... iv. 39. ἀνεμῳ και τῃ θαλασσῃ, και εἰπε. v. 33. και τρεμουσα δι' ὁ πεποιηκε λαθρα. vi. 2. ἐξεπλησσοντο ἐν τῃ διδαχῃ αὐτου, λεγοντες. vi. 23. και ὠμοσεν πολλα. vi. 55. ἠρξαντο παντας ἐπι, &c.

We have in the history of the text pointed out some MSS. which, although of more recent origin, are transcripts of older books of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, viz. Wetstein's 1. 13. 69., and Griesbach's 124., the last of which, especially, contains Asiatic readings, and is allied to the text of the Peschito. (§ 29.) To these readings the Armenian version often assents, and they are partly those which may have found a place in the version by means of the Ephesian Codex, which Mesrob's pupils brought back with them; at least it will be difficult to discover another origin for them. Matt. v. 18. ἀπο του νομου και των προφητων. 13. 124—vii. 27. πτωσις αὐτης μεγαλη σφοδρα. 13. 33. 124.—xii. 14. οἱ δε Φαρισαιοι ἐξελθοντες συμβουλιον ἐλαβον κατ' αὐτου. 13. 124.—xiii. 43. ἐν τῃ βασιλειᾳ των οὐρανων. 124.—xxi. 30. ἀποκριθεις εἰπεν, ὑπαγω, Κυριε. 13. 69. 124.—xxiii. 10. καθηγηται, ὁτι καθηγητης ὑμων ἐστιν. 124.—xxvi. 36. κἀν λεγει, αὐτοις καθισατε. 69. 124.—Mark iii. 34. περι αὐτον μαθητας καθημενους. 13. 69. 124.—viii. 14. και εἰ μη ἑνα μονον ἐχοντες ἀρτον. 1. 13. 69.—viii. 15. ζυμης των Ἡρωδιανων. 1. 13. 69.—viii. 17. διαλογιζεσθε ὀλιγοπιστοι. 13. 69. 124.—

viii. 21. πως ουν ουτω συνιετε. 69. 124.—x. 11. εαν ανηρ απολυση. 1. 13. 69. 124. &c.

Lastly, many readings are also taken from the Peschito. Mark ii. 25. ὁ Ἰησους ἐλεγεν.—vi. 6. τας κωμας διδασκων.—viii. 24. 25. περιπατουντας παλιν ἐπηθ.... ix. 4. συν Μωσει συλλαλουντες.—ix. 29. νηστειᾳ και προσευχῃ.—x. 43. γενεται ἐν ὑμιν μεγας.—xii. 33. ἐστι των ὁλοκαυτωματων.—xii. 38. και φιλουντων ἀσπασμους.—Luke ii. 49. ὁτι ἐν τῳ οἰκῳ του Πατρος.—ix. 6. κατα κωμας και κατα πολεις. We particularly reckon among these, Matt. xxviii. 18. και ἐπι γης· και καθως ἀπεσταλκε με ὁ Πατηρ μου, καγω ἀποστελλω ὑμας.

SECTION LXXXVIII.

During the Crusades, the rulers of Armenia were closely allied with the western Powers, and were acquainted with their Church-language. They laboured much in promoting a Church-union with them, which King Haitho (Abu'lfaraj calls him حاتم Hist. Dyn. 502., but Abu'lfeda هيثوم T. V. Ann. Musl. p. 18.) who afterwards resigned the government to his son, and entered into the order of the Franciscans, very much favoured. He is said to have translated Jerome's prologue from the Latin into the Armenian [h].

Gregory, Bishop of Sis, and Patriarch of the Armenians, with this view proposed to Haitho an ecclesiastical Council: in his letter to that King he declares on some points, which were connected with the question, that they were so found in Jerome, Beda the Presbyter, and other Latin Fathers [i].

[h] Michaelis—N. T. Part i. § 69. Ed. 4.

[i] Collect. Concilior. Labbæi et Cossartii, edit. Mansii, T. xxv. p. 145.

Besides that which he here says of the Latin teachers and their writings, he also quotes in the beginning of his Epistle 1 John v. 7. as authority for the use of water in the mass [k]. This to us, at least, is a record, that preparations for this union were made, and that the Armenian version was here and there modified after the Latin [l].

This same passage is expressly repeated in the Synod, which was holden at Sis in the year 1307, which could not have been the case, if it had not been authorized by several copies [m]. This individual variation of the Armenian text could scarcely have happened after the Latin copies: but, how far correctors have gone, can only be ascertained from the collation of older Armenian MSS. with the more modern.

SECTION LXXXIX.

The Armenians caused printed editions of it to be prepared in the 17th century, since the transcripts were so expensive, that only very rich people could afford them. The Patriarch sent the Bishop of Erivan, of whom we have already spoken, to Europe for this purpose, by order of a Synod holden in the year 1662. He had his seat in the monastery of Usci, whence he was called *Uscanus* in France. He caused the whole Bible to be printed at Amsterdam in the year 1666, and the New Testament by itself in the year 1668, which last is stated to have been re-

[k] Ib. p. 141.

[l] Much more useful information respecting the Armenian version may be collected from Henderson's Bibl. Researches and Travels in Russia. 1826.—Translator.

[m] Ibid. p. 136.

THE EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

SECTION XC.

After the death of Alexander, the Greeks became still more numerous in Egypt: they surrounded the throne of the Ptolemies, and got possession of the posts of public administration. The language of the court and of the servants of state naturally extended itself in Egypt, by degrees, first in the circles nearest to the court-residence, then in the more remote parts of the country. It was still impossible to destroy the hereditary tongue of the people, but this was forced to accommodate itself to it, to receive a quantity of Greek words, and often to conform its own construction to it. Thus, from the mixture of the two, a third arose, which was called Coptic, probably from Coptos, then the principal city of Upper Egypt, where the ancient language and customs most stedfastly asserted their right at a great distance from the court.

After the overthrow of the house of the Ptolemies, it again began to raise its head, and to thrust out a language, which foreigners, now without influence, had introduced into it. Yet, as it appears, the Greek maintained itself in Lower Egypt, and in the districts on the northern coast, longer than in the upper division, on account of the active traffic and barter with other nations, as well as on account of the Greeks having settled there for the longest period, and in the greatest numbers. But it was principally undisturbed in its possession of Alexandria, where at a very late time, Greek writers still made their appearance.

SECTION XCI.

At what age the Greek became so much extinct, as to cause versions to be required, or how high we may place the age of these versions, has been accurately investigated in the copious inquiries of a man, who has deserved well of this branch of literature [p].

Some would have observed, that at the Synod of Chalcedon in the year 451, Egyptian Bishops appeared, who could not so much as make their subscriptions in Greek, however simple was the form. The case is not exactly so, yet is it worthy of notice, that one at least, Kalosirius Bishop of Arsinoe, was obliged to subscribe to it by means of an interpreter [q]. The Archimandrite Barsuma was also in the same predicament: but he was a Syrian. But, the further assertion, that at the great council at Ephesus, Egyptians subscribed by the aid of interpreters, is not confirmed by the Acta. It may easily be supposed, that those Bishops were not sent to it, who were the least versed in the language, in which the business was transacted. We cannot therefore so easily expect historical data for our proposition from foreign countries, as from the interior of the land.

Here, also, in the first instance we are opposed by Father Pachomius, who composed his rules for the Monks of the Tabennitic Monastery, in the Thebais,

[p] D. Fred. Munter on the age of the Coptic versions of the New Testament in Eichhorn's General Library of Bib. Lit. 4 vol. 1st and 3rd articles.

[q] Καλοσιριος Ἐπισκοπος Ἀρσινοϊτου, ἑρμηνευοντος αὐτον Ἰουλιου διακονου αὐτου.

originally in Egyptian, which were afterwards translated into Greek, and by Jerome into Latin[r]. Too hasty a conclusion, that no one in the Tabennitic Monastery understood Greek, has hence been drawn; but the fact most assuredly proves, that Pachomius deemed the language of the country to be that, in which he was best able to make himself understood by all, without exception, so much so, that he made it the common tongue of seven thousand Monks, for so great does Palladius reckon their number.

Now since Pachomius exacted from his pupils in the 139th and 140th § of his rules, that they *all of them* should learn to read, and even be obliged against their wills, each at least to read the New Testament and Psalter, he therefore pre-supposes the existence of versions to be read. Moreover, in consequence of the language, which he has used in the composition of his rules, he does not take for granted, that *all* of them understood Greek, yet he requires *from all*, without exception, that they should know the characters, receive instructions in reading at certain hours of the day, and that at least they might be in a sufficient state of forwardness to read the New Testament and the Psalter.

On one occasion, Father Pachomius sent some of his Monks to Alexandria, to greet the Archbishop Athanasius, and to purchase some necessaries for the sick. In the Church an Alexandrian named Theodorus saw them and requested them, by means of an interpreter, to allow him to accompany them to the Thebais. It was granted. Pachomius received the

[r] Hier. Præf. in Reg. S. Pachomii § 2. Urgebant autem missi ad me ob hanc ipsam causam Leontius Presbyter et cæteri cum eo fratres, accito notario, ut erant de Ægyptiacâ in Græcam linguam versa, nostro sermone dictari.

stranger[s] very kindly, and that he might have some one with whom he could converse, he gave him an old man, who understood Greek, as his companion.

Theodorus, a different person from the preceding, the favourite pupil of Pachomius, and his successor after his death, caused the Epistle on festivals, which Athanasius had published concerning that at Easter, to be translated into Egyptian for the use of the Monastery, that it might serve as a rule for the Monks. When he proposed his scheme to the assembled Monks, he appointed an interpreter, to render his words into Greek for the Alexandrians, and the foreigners, who were unacquainted with the Egyptian[t].

Dux Arsenius, an imperial deputy, visited the Monasteries in Upper Egypt, which were subject to Theodorus, for the purpose of finding a person, who was suspected to be concealed in one of them. In the Monastery of Phebon he assembled the brethren, and made his inquiries on the subject through an interpreter. Fortunately a foreigner was in the Monastery, a native of Armenia, who knew Greek, and so defended his brethren before this imperial envoy, that he departed without a further search[u].

Very shortly after this *datum*, we find another in Lower Egypt, in the direction of Libya, in the last half of the fourth century. Palladius, who then was travelling among other countries through Egypt, for the sake of visiting the most celebrated Monkish institutions, came to Nitria, where he saw John of

[s] Zoega Catalog. Cod. Copticor. MSS., qui in Museo Borgiano asservantur. Romæ MDCCCX. Codd. Memphit. n. XLV. p. 76, 77. Copt. p. 81. Lat.

[t] Zoega Catal. Cod. Memph. xlvi. p. 83. Copt. p. 86. Lat. Cf. Codd. Sahid. n. clxxvii. p. 371.

[u] Ibm. Cod. Memph. n. xlv. p. 81, 82. Copt. et Lat. 85.

Lycopolis, one of the abbots of the desert, and solicited his conversation. But the old man understood so little of Greek, that he required an interpreter to speak to the foreigner. Yet, it appears from the substance of the conversation, that John was not unacquainted with the books of the New Testament. Therefore they must also have had a translation of it in their own dialect in Lower Egypt[x].

One of the founders and most active promoters of the Egyptian Monasteries was unacquainted with Greek, and was forced to make himself intelligible by an interpreter, when he addressed Greeks. This is Antonius, who acquired great fame and celebrity at the time of the Synod of Nice. Palladius informs us, that he was ignorant of Greek, on the authority of a man, who long lived with Antonius, and who was also his interpreter[y].

Jerome, in the life of Hilarion the Hermit, mentions also Isaac, another of his interpreters[z].

Since Antonius was far and wide holden in so great estimation, he could not want opportunities of edifying others by his exhortations. Jerome praised his admonitory writings of this nature, which were seven in number, all composed in Egyptian, and afterwards translated into Greek[a].

[x] Palladii Historia Lausiaca, c. xliii. de Abbate Joanne urbis Lyco. p. 963. in Magnâ Bibliothecâ Vett. Patr. in xvii. tomos distributa. T. xiii. Paris, 1654. fol.

[y] Palladius, c. xxvi. de Eulogio Alexandrino. p. 941. *Τουτων των ὁλων λογων ἑρμηνευς αὐτος γεγονα, του Μακαριου Ἀντωνιου Ἑλληνιστι μη εἰδοτος· ἐγω γαρ ἠπισταμην ἀμφοτερων τας γλωσσας, και ἑρμηνευσα αὐτοις.*

[z] Vita Hilarionis. c. 30. repertis ibi duobus Monachis Isaac et Pelusiano, quorum Isaac interpres Antonii fuerat.

[a] Hieron. Cat. Script. Eccl. V. Antonius. Misit Ægyptiacè ad diversa monasteria Apostolici sensûs sermonisque Epistolas septem,

he betook himself to remoter regions of the Thebais, where he made exhortations to the Anchorites, who were around him, which are full of Biblical passages [e].

When, however, Greek philosophers approached him, (Athanasius proceeds), he required an interpreter, for the purpose of conversing with them [f].

When he spoke to his own countrymen, he spoke Egyptian; when he wrote to them, he wrote in Egyptian; when the Greeks approached him, he spoke by means of an interpreter: he generally had an interpreter with him, and one who himself had interpreted for him assures us, that he had no knowledge of Greek. I do not see, what we can wish further to accredit the fact, that Antonius understood nothing of Greek.

But a Biography asserts respecting him, that by a divine miracle, he suddenly understood Greek. What biography? Were the ancients possessors of any, besides that of Athanasius, and of Evagrius, which was only a translation of it? No one of any consideration ventured to attempt one after Athanasius: Jerome excuses himself on account of these his predecessors, and Ruffinus accounts it superfluous and impracticable, to undertake such a task after him. What one legend is there then, to which appeal might be made? If the Bollandists found none worthy of their attention: of what authority then must that be, which would contradict cotemporary writers, and even the very interpreter of Antonius! If, however, he knew nothing of Greek, how happened

[e] Loc. cit. c. 55.

[f] Loc. cit. c. 72. τοτε γουν φιλοσοφοι δυο ηλθον προς αὐτον Ἑλληνες....ἐξελθων προς αὐτους ἐφη δι' ἑρμηνεως. c. 77. ἐφη παλιν δι' ἑρμηνεως.

it? how was it possible for him to have had such an intimate acquaintance with the Old and New Testament, unless by means of a translation? According to the testimony of Augustine, he was even able to repeat the whole of the Scriptures from memory[g], which is the less extraordinary, since there were many inhabitants of the Desert able to do the same[h].

In Nitria, in the nome of Arsinoe, in the Thebais, in Upper, Lower, and Middle Egypt the New Testament was read during the fourth century, in an Egyptian version. These documents must be worthy of a fair and respectable age, even if none of them were authorized to lay claim to an earlier date.

Yet are we not wanting in notices, from whence we may argue in favour of the earlier existence of the Egyptian versions. In the time of Diocletian's persecution, at the beginning of the fourth century, the Prætor of Upper Egypt travelled in search of Christians: and when one of his own accord presented himself to him, he sat on his tribunal, and made the investigation by the aid of an interpreter, and thus passed sentence of death[i].

Hieracles of Leonto composed towards the end of the sixth century books in the Egyptian language, one of which was a treatise on the works of the six days. A translation of the books of Moses must certainly have preceded any labour of this sort[k].

[g] Augustin. de doctr. Christ. L. i. § 4.

[h] Palladius. c. xii. in Ammonio, παλαιαν δε και καινην γραφην ἀπεστηθισεν. Vita Abb. Aphthonii c. xxxix. ἀποστηθισουσι πασας τας γραφας. Cf. c. xxxii. de Eron. Epiph. L. iii. Hær. L. viii. p. 1071. ἐν στοματι δε σχεδον πασαν θειαν γραφην ἀπαγγελουσι.

[i] Zoega. Cat. Codd. Memph. n. xix. p. 20, 21.

[k] Epiph. L. ii. Hær. xlvii. § 3. p. 712. συνεγραψατο δε Ἑλληνικως τε και Αἰγυπτιακως ἐξηνησαμενος και συνταξας της ἑξαημερου.

Much, however, as the Greek language prevailed until the overthrow of the Ptolemies, it was nevertheless constantly excluded from the temples; they only offered to the Gods Egyptian prayers and thanksgivings: the Egyptian was exclusively the language of Religion. From this custom, it may have been useful, perhaps necessary to introduce in the Christian assemblies the Egyptian language for prayer, singing and edification, whence in a short time, the translation of the sacred books must have been occasioned [l].

SECTION XCII.

The Egyptian, or if we like it better, the Coptic language is divided into several dialects, of which two are particularly distinguished, that of Upper Egypt or the Thebaic, and that of Lower Egypt or the Memphitic. The Arabs also call the first صعيدي that of the Upper country, the Sahidic, and the other بحيري that of the coast, although it also prevails at some distance from the coast of the Mediterranean, and has more of the interior of the country towards Memphis, under its influence. Besides these, they likewise reckon a third, which is called بشموري the Bashmuric or Bshamyric, of the country of which we shall speak in the sequel [m].

[l] Porphyr. de Abst. L. iv. § 9. è Porph. Euseb. de Præp. Ev. L. iii. c. 4. Steph. p. 57. Ed. Vigeri, p. 94. Clem. Alex. Pæd. L. ii. c. 2. Venet. p. 252, 53.

[m] See the examples in Quatremere, recherches sur la langue et la literature del Egypte, Paris, 1808. p. 21. extracted from the Arabico-Coptic Grammar of Athanasius Von Kus.

SECTION XCIII.

Of the translation of the New Testament in the dialect of Lower Egypt several beautiful MSS. are still preserved in the Libraries at Rome, Paris, and Oxford: it has also been presented by the press to the hands of the learned [a].

Those, who are capable of forming a judgment on the subject, do not entirely agree either with the editor's knowledge of the language or his adequacy to the task. Yet will it ever be a great merit, to have broken the way, and to have first brought to light so inestimable a document.

The translation is taken from the revised text, and in the Gospels follows the MSS. B.C.L.:—in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles A.B.C., and throughout it follows that family of MSS., which we have cited, as the exemplaria of Hesychius. Hence may we judge, what value it has, and how worthy it were of being executed with new care. Its MSS. often differ from each other in various readings, and the critic here might still have to undertake an excellent task.

From this observation we may retrospectively make some decision as to its age; for it could not have been composed before Hesychius, nor before the middle of the third century. Now, if it was read in Lower Egypt in the fourth century, the space of time, in which it arose, is pretty accurately measured, as accurately as we can desire in a point, in which

[a] Novum Testamentum Ægyptiacum, vulgò Copticum, ex MSS. Bodleianis descripsit, cum Vaticano et Parisiensibus contulit, et in Latinum Sermonem convertit David Wilkins, Oxonii, è Theatro Sheldoniano. 1716. 4.

from want of precise chronological epochs we are obliged to avail ourselves of every thing combining to fix its date.

SECTION XCIV.

Woide first gave, as specimens to the learned world, the readings of some pages of the Upper Egyptian or Sahidic version of the Gospels, which he found in the British Museum [o]. After him John Aloys Mingarell edited from the Library of the Chevalier Nani the text of some fragments of the Gospels, which he has illustrated with some remarks [p]. The Library of Cardinal Borgia contains similar fragments, which Münter, now Bishop of Seland, examined, the readings of which he has published [q]. He unites the readings of De Woide, and others, which presented themselves in Nani's fragments. Anthony Georgi also employed himself on some very ancient pages of the Thebaic version, which Borgia possessed, which had, on the side, the Greek text in uncial characters, from which however the version frequently departed. They contain John vi. 21—59., vi. 68., viii. 23 [r]. These are the remains of the Gospels, then known and brought to light in Europe.

[o] John Andrew Cramer's Contribution to the advancement of Theology and other important sciences, iii. Pt. 1779.

[p] Ægyptiorum codicum reliquiæ Venetiis in Bibliothecâ Nanianâ asservatæ. Fasc. i. Bononiæ 1785.

[q] M. Fred. Münter Commentatio de indole Versionis Novi Testam. Sahidicæ. Hafniæ, 1789.

[r] Fragmentum Evangelii S. Johannis Græco-Copto-Thebaicum sæculi iv. Additamentum ex vetustissimis Membranis Lectionum Evangelicarum.... ex Veliterno Museo Borgiano.... operâ et studio F. Augustini Antonii Georgii Eremitæ Augustiniani. Romæ apud Ant. Fulgonium. 1789. 4.

The Bodleian Library possesses the Acts of the Apostles in this version, except the four last chapters, in MS. Cod. Huntingd. 394. 8. from which Woide communicated some remarkable variations to Chevalier Michaelis, who published them [t].

This MS. contains the Catholic Epistles of John and Jude, and a passage of the second Epistle of Peter. The variations from the Epistles of the two first, viz. of John and Jude, are likewise generally known by means of Woide [t].

Some fragments of the Epistles of Paul were in the hands of Cardinal Borgia, which Münter has collated, from which also he has edited three fragments of the two Epistles to Timothy, entire as they stand, for the sake of giving those acquainted with this language an opportunity of informing themselves of the state of this version [u].

About the same time, Adler had transcribed from the increasing treasures of the Cardinal some passages of Matthew and Luke, and afterwards communicated them to Woide, who proceeded to collect them with laudable assiduity:—he brought together from the Church-books some chapters of the Gospels and Epistles, and even some minor quotations, he was moreover able to procure fragments from Upper Egypt [x], and by the aid of that, which the press had already published, he produced by degrees a Sahidic New Testament, which has indeed many chasms, although it is of great value in points of criticism and grammar. Woide died without having completed

[t] John David Michaelis Orient. et Exeget. Library, Pt. iii. p. 199—208.

[t] Ibm. x. Pt. 1776. p. 198—214.

[u] M. Fr. Münter Comment. de indole Vers. N. T. Sahid—accedunt fragmenta Epist. Pauli ad Timotheum. § 10. n. 65. f.

[x] Woidii de vers. Bib. Æg. diss. c. 2. de vers. N. T. Sahid.

all that he had proposed to himself, yet the man was found in Henry Ford, who ably perfected the work, corrected some oversights of Woide, and brought the whole to light with several additaments in a handsome form, as an Appendix to the Codex Alexandrinus [y].

Unfortunately the two English scholars could not get access to Borgia's collection, which still contained many fragments of the Gospels and of Paul's Epistles, among others that to the Philippians entire, excepting a few verses, and some chapters of the Apocalypse. Zoega has given a copious catalogue of the parts to be supplied, which a subsequent editor of the Sahidic New Testament searched out in the Museum at Velletri [z]. Had it occurred to him to have inserted these supplements in his excellent work on the Borgiano-Egyptian MSS., we should possess, what now another must seek afresh. Instead of which, he satisfied himself with publishing the three fragments of Eph. v. 21—33., Apoc. xix. 7. 18., Apoc. xx. 7., xxi. 2 [a].

SECTION XCV.

Its text approaches very closely to the MSS. of Hesychius's edition: yet the version exhibits no revised text, but that of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, which is indeed analogous to the text of Hesychius, since it proceeded from it:—generally speaking it is not arranged in sections, and more frequently accords with

[y] Appendix ad editionem N. T. è codice MS. Alexandrino à C. G. Woide descripti, in quâ continentur fragm. N. T. dialecti superioris Ægypti, &c. Oxon. è typ. Clarend. 1799. fol.

[z] Zoega, Catal. Codd. Copti MSS. Musei Borgiani, p. 203—206.

[a] Zoega, loc. cit. 218—220.

the Cambridge MS. D in peculiar readings, and often has its own peculiar variations, which are considerable.

We will adduce some of the readings which are now only found in D. In Luke viii. 41. the Sahidic Version omits the words, ὑπηρχε και—in Luke viii. 42. και αὐτη ἀπεθνησκεν, instead of the whole passage it reads ἀποθνησκουσα: in Luke viii. 43. οὐκ ἰσχυσεν ὑπ' οὐδενος θεραπευθηναι it renders ἡν οὐδε εἰς ἰσχυεν θεραπευσα ··ix. 10. εἰς τοπον ἐρημον πολ··καλ··Βηθσ··it renders εἰς κωμην λεγομενην Βηθσαϊδα, ix. 37. ἐν τῃ ἑξης ἡμερᾳ—δια της ἡμερας. xiii. 25. και κρουειν την θυραν, it omits την θυραν, and xiii. 27. the words ποθεν ἐστε. xxii. 24. αὐτων δοκει εἰναι—ἀν εἰη. xxii. 26. νεωτερος—μικροτερος. xxiii. 14. εὑρον ἐν τῳ ἀνθρωπῳ τουτῳ αἰτιον—εὑρον αἰτιον. In John vi. 23. it excludes the words, εὐχαριστησαντος του Κυριου. vi. 25. ὡδε γεγονας—ὡδε ἐληλυθας. vii. 10. ὡς is wanting before ἐν κρυπτῳ. vii. 23. ἐμοι χολατε—πως ἐμοι χολατε. vii. 52. και ἰδε ὁτι—και ἰδε τας γραφας, ὁτι. x. 2. ποιμην ἐστι—αὐτος ἐστιν ὁ ποιμην. x. 12. ἁρπαζει αὐτα και—ἁρπαζει και. ix. 33. ἐνεβριμησατο τῳ Πνευματι, και ἐταραξεν ἑαυτον—ἐταραχθη τῳ Πνευματι, ὡς ἐμβριμωμενος. xi. 39. ἡ ἀδελφη—Μαρθα ἡ ἀδελφη. xii. 29. βροντην γεγονεναι—ὁτι βροντη γεγονεν. xii. 30. ἡ φωνη γεγονεν—ἡ φωνη ἠλθεν. xiii. 36. ὑπαγω ἐγω. xvii. 5. προ του τον κοσμον εἰναι, παρα σοι—παρα σοι, προ του γενεσθαι τον κοσμον. xviii. 1. χειμαῤῥου του Κεδρου. xx. 22. ἐνεφυσησε αὐτοις, και····

We now cite a few of those readings which exclusively belong to it. John vi. 33. ὁ γαρ ἀρτος οὐτος υἱος του Θεου ἐστι.—vi. 39. ἱνα οὐς δεδωκε μοι, μη ἀπολεσω ἐξ αὐτων, ἀλλα ἀναστησω αὐτους.—vii. 11. ἐζητουν αὐτον ἐν τῳ ναῳ, και ἐλεγον.—vii. 26. οἱ ἀρχοντες και οἱ ἀρχιερεις, ὁτι.—x. 7. εἰμι ὁ ποιμην των προβατων.—x. 31. οἱ Ἰουδαιοι, ἱνα ἐκβαλωσιν αὐτον.—x. 33. οὐ λιθαζομεν σε, ἀλλ' ὁτι βλασφημεις.—xiv. 22. Ἰουδας ὁ Κανανιτης, Κυριε, τι γεγονεν, ὁτι

ἡμιν μελλεις ἐμφανιζειν σεαυτον, και οὐχι μελλεις ἐμφανιζειν σεαυτον τῳ κοσμῳ ;—κ'. τ'. λ'.

The extracts which Woide has given from the Huntingdon MS. of the Sahidic Acts of the Apostles, are only calculated to draw our attention to the extraordinary uniformity, which prevailed between the Codex D. and the Sahidic version, with regard to the text. It is, according to the specimens which he has given, really very great.

We have no longer any Greek document of the Catholic Epistles, which might disclose to us their κοινη ἐκδοσις. As they appear in this version, they are indeed nearly allied to the MSS. of Hesychius's edition, yet they do not strictly correspond to them, for they exhibit such variations as confirm our former statements respecting the text, which was the basis of this version. We will cite some examples, which may convince us of the free state of this text. 1 John i. 2. και ἐφανερωθη ἡμιν. ἑωρακαμεν αὐτην. ὁ ἑωρακαμεν. κ'. τ'. λ'.; ii. 17. ὁ δε ποιων το θελημα του Θεου, μενει εἰς τον αἰωνα, ὡς αὐτος μενει εἰς αἰωνα. Thus, also, Cyprian read the passage: qui autem fecerit voluntatem Dei, manet in æternum, quomodo Deus manet in æternum. Tract. ii. de hab. Virg. et de lapsis. Serm. 5tus. —1 John iii. 10. πας ὁ μη ποιων δικαιοσυνην the version reads, as Origen (Comment. in Joh. T. iv. Opp. p. 323.) and Tertullian (de pudic. c. 19.) πας ὁ μη ὡν δικαιος. 1 John iv. 2. γινωσκεται το Πνευμα του Θεου, και το πνευμα της πλανης. 3d Epistle of John, 3. μαρτυρουντων περι σου ἐν ἀληθειᾳ, and ver. 10. και μη ἀρκουμ. ἐπ. τουτ. οὐδε ἐπιδεχεται ἡμας, οὐδε ἐπιδεχεται ἀδελφους.

The case is nearly the same with Paul's Epistles. They commonly adhere to the MSS. A.B.C. or A.B.C.D.E.F.G. sometimes also to D.E.F.G. or to some of them, when they are unsupported by any agreement with the others; the last instance occurs

in 1 Cor. ii. 4. πειθοις σοφιας. iii. 13. ἀποκαλυφθησεται. D. E. x. 27. where, after των ἀπιστων, the MSS. D.E.F.G. add εἰς δεικνον. or xii. 10. where the version reads διακρισις, like G. xiv. 14. ἐαν προσευχωμαι. F.G. Gal. iv. 21. τον νομον οὐκ ἀναγινωσκετε. 28. ὑμεις — τεκνα ἐστε. D.F.G. vi. 2. ἀναπληρωσετε. G. Col. iii. 8. ἐκ του στοματος ὑμων μη ἐκπορευεσθω. G. iii. 13. οὑτω και ὑμεις ποιειτε. D.E.F.G. 2 Thess. i. 12. like D.E. it omits the word Χριστου after του Κυριου ἡμων Ἰησου. ii. 2. it has ἀπο του νοος ὑμων, like D.E. 1 Tim. ii. 1. παρακαλει οὐν πρωτον, like D.E. ii. 5. διαλογισμου, like F.G. vi. 17. τοις πλουσιοις του νυν αἰωνος, D.E. and παντα πλουσιως εἰς ἀπολαυσιν, as the two before quoted MSS.

But it more frequently indulges in liberties, which are not discovered in any of the other documents, as 1 Tim. ii. 7. ἀληθ. λεγ. οὐ ψευδομαι, ἐν τοις ἐθνεσι ἐν πιστει και ἀληθειᾳ. iii. 2. ἀνδρα νηφαλιον ἐν σωφροσυνῃ, κοσμιον. iii. 15. πως δει ἐν οἰκῳ Θεου ζωντος ἀναστρεφεσθαι, ἡτις ἐστι στυλος. vi. 10. φιλαργυρια, ἡ τινας ἐξ αὐτων ἀπεπλανησεν. vi. 20. την παραθηκην φυλαξον, ἡν παρεθηκα σοι, ἐκτρεπ

When we consider the place, by means of which the Greek was introduced into Egypt, and its situation with reference to other parts of the country, and according to this measure the advance of Hellenism by a gradual communication to the distant provinces, it cannot well be denied that the Greek arrived late in the Thebais: there it obtained by no means a firm footing, and at the extinction of the power of the Ptolemies again fell into decline and disuse. Alexandria, situated on the outward border of the land, or rather the very entrance of Egypt towards the sea, was that, from whence Hellenism was spread in the adjoining districts, from whence it gradually extended its grasp, and advanced step by step further into the more remote regions.

Hellenism also continued to receive fresh support in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, whilst the parts of the land more remote from the Court, the peculiar scene of action of the Greeks, sustained less intrusion from them and from their language. Hence, when the ancient language, after the overthrow of the Greek dominion, again raised its head, it first asserted its prerogative there, where it had mostly lived, viz. in Upper Ægypt. Consequently, it was in this part of the land, that a native version of the Bible was necessary and was desired.

I adopt a stronger reason for the higher antiquity of the Thebaic version from the state of the language. It is strange to find the language of the Upper Ægyptian version mixed with a by far greater number of Greek words, than that of the Memphitic or version of Lower Egypt, since this having been immediately altered by the Greek, could not but have been more disfigured and corrupted. The solution of this paradox lies in the difference of antiquity: when the Memphitic version was composed, the Ægyptian was much more used, and purified from foreign additions, whilst, on the contrary, when the Sahidic was undertaken; the language still introduced ancient foreign materials, which the Greek government had forced upon it.

SECTION XCVI.

In Borgia's collection small fragments of a third Ægyptian version are found, differing in language from the two, which we have just been considering. The passages are, 1 Cor. vii. 36—ix. 16., and xiv. 33—xv. 35., which two scholars, though unconnected with each other, Georgi in Rome, and Münter in Co-

penhagen, published nearly at the same time [b]. The Cardinal afterwards obtained more fragments of this version: two from Isaiah, and the following from the New Testament: Joh. iv. 28-34., iv. 36-40., iv. 43-47., iv. 48-53., 1 Cor. vi. 9.—ix. 16., xvi. 3.—xv. 35., Eph. vi. 18. *ad finem*, Phil. i. 1.—ii. 2., 1 Thess. i. 1.—iii. 5., Heb. v. 10.—x. 22., which, like the preceding, have been brought to light by two competitors in the same cities, Rome and Copenhagen, who were, nevertheless, perfectly independent of each other. With these, Zoega adorned his catalogue of the Borgiano-Coptic MSS.[c], and Engelbreth accurately edited them [d]. The first merely gave the simple text, without any critical labour, even without the separation of the words: Engelbreth bestowed pains upon it, accompanied it with a translation, with an introduction and critical remarks at the end, and acquired the credit of having accomplished it with that diligence and judgment which in every case is required. Yet, we discover between them some textual variations, where the true reading oftener seems to be on the side of Zoega, who again and again, when he pleased, might consult and accurately examine the original writings [e].

These fragments being in their language neither Theban nor Memphitic, induced Father Georgi to

[b] Georgi in præf. ad fragm. Joann. Græco-Copto-Thebaicum § 12. p. lv. sq. Münter in comment. de vers. N. T. Sahid. §. 12. 13. p. 75. sq.

[c] Zoega, Catal. p. 145-169.

[d] W. F. Engelbreth Fragmenta Basmurico-Copt. Vet. et Nov. Test., quæ in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur, &c. Hauniæ, 1811, 4to.

[e] Observations sur les fragmens Coptes-Baschmouriques publiés par M. Engelbreth—Article de M. Champollion le Jeune, p. 350-61. dans les Annales Encyclopediques. Fevrier 1818.

refer them to the third dialect or the Bashmuric. When he surveyed the region, in which this dialect seemed to be vernacular, he was inclined for several reasons to fix upon the Oases, particularly the Ammonian Oasis, whence he called it the Ammonian dialect[f].

His mistake concerning Bashmur, or the native country of the Bashmurites, was corrected by Zoega, who shewed Bashmur to have been a country to the East in the Delta, to which the Bashmurian dialect and the Bashmurian version therefore might belong[g]. Still more definitely has a French scholar shewn from many passages, that Bashmur lay to the East in the Delta, between the two arms of the Nile at Damiat and Ashmune'rroman. Yet, from the striking analogy of these fragments to the dialect of Upper Ægypt, he is inclined to transpose the seat of this dialect, in the direction of Upper Ægypt; and for the sake of parrying off the passage in Athanasius of Kus, who reckons no more than three Ægyptian dialects, he pronounces the two Upper, viz. the small and the great Oasis not to have been situated *in* Ægypt, but *beyond* and *next* to it[h].

Different was the decision of the Danish scholar, who nearly at the same time competed with Georgi in editing and publishing the first fragments. He denied, that its difference of language was sufficiently important, to require the admission, that it was a peculiar dialect, that it was a variety of that of Upper Ægypt[i]. Engelbreth, on the other hand, attempted to assert the rank of a dialect to this

[f] Georgi, lib. cit. præf. § 14-17.

[g] Zoega, Catal. p. 140—44. Quatremère, Recherches sur la langue et la literature de l' Egypte. § 5. p. 147. sq.

[h] Quatremère, Recherches. P. 216-217.

[i] Münter, Comment. de Vers. N. T. Sahid. § 12. p. 77.

version, which he declared to be the Bashmuric, of course, placing it in the Delta[k]. Nevertheless, Champollion the younger, who criticized him, perceived no necessity of pronouncing it a distinct dialect: for the language of the third version may be a middle dialect between those of Upper and Lower Ægypt, and probably acknowledges Faiom as its native country[l].

In the determination of this question, into all the minutiæ of which we cannot enter, it seems, that they have not properly distinguished between dialect and idiom. The softness of pronunciation, which characterizes this version of the Bible, since it almost always avoids the aspirates Θ, Φ, X, as well as *Phei* and *Chei*, and cannot enunciate the P, but, like Alcibiades, uses the Λ instead of it, as well as the exchange of A for O and of E for A, entirely lie within the compass of idiom. This is also the case with some of its words, which were indigenous and current in certain districts[m]. Unless peculiar

[k] Engelbreth, Fragmenta Basmur. Copt. § 2. p. 7. sq.

[l] Observations, dans les Annales Encyclopediques. Fevrier, 1818.

[m] Among the words enumerated as peculiar to the Bashmuric dialect (Engelbreth Frag. Bas. Cop. p. ix.). are Isaiah v. 20. ⲕⲏⲗⲉⲧⲥ and Is. v. 25. ⲥⲡⲉⲧ:—yet both exist in the Memphitic ⲭⲏⲗⲥ*.

* Hug has erred in these observations: for ⲭⲏⲗⲥ does not occur in the Memphitic version: ⲕⲏⲗⲉⲧⲥ is ⲕⲁⲕⲉ Thebaicè and ⲭⲁⲕⲓ Memphiticè. Nor does ⲥⲱⲡⲧ occur in the Memphitic, it is probably peculiar to the Thebaic dialect: the Memphitic word is ϫⲱⲡⲧ. Nor is he even *ad rem*, when he mentions the recurrence of *ὀνατα* in the form of ⲟⲩⲟⲩ, which indeed is found in the common Coptic, but in a totally different sense; yet the Basmuric dialect makes use of ⲁⲧⲁ and ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲁ *for a multitude*, where the Greek word is metonymically applied. ⲑⲁⲗⲗⲓⲟ also does not occur in the Memphitic version of this verse.—Transl.

forms are added in the formation of verbs and nouns, so that the variation does not merely consist in the pronunciation or particular expressions, but influences the structure of the language itself, it cannot be considered as a dialect.

It is not however so with these Bashmuric fragments: they adhere, as to formation, to the Thebaic dialect, yet not so exclusively as not to partake also of the forms of the Memphitic, just as if they were a variety of both; on which account, I have before indulged myself in the hypothesis, that possibly they might exhibit the idiom of Middle Ægypt. Had Champollion confined his hypothesis to the province of PHAIOM, I do not see how it could be confuted: yet, I am desirous of perceiving the promised proofs in substantiation of his decision in favour of PHAIOM.

But this is not the only Ægyptian idiom of which we have fragments. Zoega makes us acquainted with a monastic legend, which varies between the Thebaic, Memphitic, and Bashmuric, in which he has the gratification of discerning a fourth dialect[a].

Far more important to us is the question, what particular text did the third version follow? Engelbreth has drawn the comparison for us, of which the following is the result. The fragment in John iv. 28-53. for the most part adheres to MSS. B.C.L.; but Paul's Epistles follow the MSS. A.B.C., yet not so as to

and ϭⲱⲙⲧ. The word *ονατ* re-appears in ⲟⲩⲟⲧ: but ⲧⲱⲙ stands in the Thebaic dialect for *συνηθεια* (Münter, Comment. de indole vers. N. T. Sahidicæ. p. 81.) For *ῥιζα, i. e. ανθρωπων*, the expression is ⲑⲉⲣⲓⲟ—Is. v. 24. in the Memphitic ⲑⲁⲣⲓⲟ *πλασμα*—merely a bold poetic phrase, which could not occur in every language.

[a] Zoega. Codd. Sahid. N. clxxii.

confine themselves to this regulated text, for they frequently harmonize with D.E.F.G., or with particular books of them, on which account they express the more ancient text of the uncorrected or common editions. This state of the text must be referred to the other half of the third century in Ægypt and Asia, whence we see what particular age this version might claim. With it the state of the language agrees: it is as impure, as mixed with a multitude of Greek words, as we have perceived the Thebaic version to be, which we have cited as a proof of its age.

But here I cannot prevent myself from a doubt: is the third indeed a real version, that is, one made from the original text? It so follows the Thebaic version step by step, word for word, that it appears, as *if* this had been thankfully received as it was, and only transferred into the third idiom. Wherever the Thebaic retains Greek expressions, this retains them; wherever the Thebaic adopts a peculiar turn of language, this adopts it. Thus, 1 Cor. ix. 15. κενωσῃ, ⲛⲁϣⲧⲣⲉϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ. Phil. i. 10. ἀπροσκοποι ⲉⲙⲙⲉⲛ ⲛⲟⲃⲓ ⲭⲓ ⲉⲯⲟⲧⲛ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲉⲛ [p]. Where, in however trifling a degree, it secedes from the Thebaic dialect, it is an error of the writer, 1 Cor. ix. 14. or a gloss. Heb. vii. 20. ⲛϣⲁⲉⲛⲉⲯ [q].

[o] The Bashmuric reading is ⲧⲣⲉϥϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ, but the Memphitic adopts a totally different reading.—Translator.

[p] ⲉⲙⲙⲏ ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲭⲓ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲏ is the reading of the Thebaic version: Hug seems to have carelessly transcribed these passages, and to have inattentively examined these versions.—Translator.

[q] The instance to which he alludes in 1 Cor. ix. 14. is doubtless ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁⲥⲧⲉⲣⲓⲟⲛ, which, on account of the ὁμοιοτελευτον, the Bashmuric Translator substituted for ⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ, which was in the preceding part of verse: the Thebaic and Memphitic Translators have, notwithstanding, repeated it. In the other instance, Heb.

It would have been for the greatest part impracticable to have collated these fragments with the Thebaic text, had not Engelbreth afforded to us the means. For he has collected as many of the corresponding Thebaic passages, as he then found in the Borgian Museum, and placed them by the side of the third version, whence we are in possession of the following passages, which are wanting in Woide. 1 Cor. xv. 5-33., Phil. i. 7-23., 1 Thess. i. 4.—iii. 6., Heb. ix. 2.-11., ix. 24-30. x. 5-10.

THE ÆTHIOPIC VERSION.

SECTION XCVII.

A MERCHANT, or a man of research, from Tyre, made, in the time of Constantine the Great, a voyage through the Red Sea to Æthiopia: he and all the ship's company were murdered by the Blacks, except two youths, Frumentius and Ædesius, who were brought as slaves to the King, with whom, on account of their ability, they had an agreeable life at Court. After the death of the King, during the minority of his son, and the guardianship of his mother, Frumentius attempted to establish Christianity, to which he was devoted, in these regions, and to be more certain of success, undertook a journey to Athanasius at Alexandria, by whom he was

vii. 20. ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲉⲛⲉⲥ *(for ever)* is decidedly a gloss, and wanting to the Thebaic and Memphitic.—TRANSLATOR.

consecrated Bishop, and furnished with full power and authority [r].

Athanasius makes mention of this Frumentius in his apology to the Emperor Constantius, in which he complains, that he had been persecuted by letters addressed even to the rulers of Æthiopia, and that Frumentius, Bishop of Axum, had been summoned to be initiated into Arianism [s]: he also quotes a summons of this description, in which Frumentius is suspected as a partizan of Athanasius, and pointed out to George of Ægypt, that he might cite him and submit his creed to an examination [t].

Now, since Cedrenus and Nicephorus Callistus have referred the establishment of Christianity in Æthiopia to the times of Justinian [u], they are *manifestly* wrong, and seem to have mistaken a mission of Nonnosus to Axum, which happened under this King, for an attempt at conversion, although no religious commission any where appears in it [x].

Yet, whilst Frumentius so vigorously followed his designs for the conversion of the Abyssinians, and even attained his object, he must have thought of a version of the SS. in the language of the country, if not for the use of the nation, yet for the use of those who attended his ministry. One, indeed, would not have been sufficient in so extended a country, in which there was such a variety of dialects. An Arabic

[r] Ruffinus in the first book of his continuation of Eusebius's Ecc. Hist. which is called in some editions the 10th l. 9. c. of Eusebius. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 19. Theodoret. His. E. l. i. c. 23. Sozomen. l. ii. c. 24. Ab'ulpharag. Hist. Dyn. p. 135. text. Arab.

[s] Athanas. Apol. ad Constant. c. 29.

[t] Ibm. c. 31.

[u] Cedren. Ann. l. xvii. c. 32. Niceph. H. E. l. viii. c. 35.

[x] Photii Bib. Cod. 3.

writer, who had seen part of Abyssinia, reckons in the land of Zaila alone more than fifty dialects [y].

The Abyssinians mention, with particular distinction, among their first preachers of the faith, a certain Aba Salama [z], and a native poet and an Æthiopic Martyrology ascribes to him the translation of the books of the Law and the Gospel from the Arabic into their tongue [a]. Yet, with respect to the original Arabic text, from whence this version is said to have proceeded, much uncertainty must prevail; or that which we now have, could not have been the work of a man so much reverenced among his compatriots.

It is composed in the old dialect of Axum, which, when another Dynasty from Sewa mounted the throne, must have yielded the pre-eminence of being the royal tongue to the Amharic dialect [b]. It was first published at Rome, and then re-edited in the English Polyglott [c].

[y] Macrizi regum Islam. in Abyssiniâ, edit. Theod. Rinck, Lugd. Bat. p. 14. text. Arab.

[z] Jobi Ludolphi Historia Æthiopica, l. iii. c. 2. edit. Origen.

[a] Idem, Commentar. in Hist. Æthiop. l. iii. c. 4. p. 295.

[b] Idem. Hist. Æth. l. i. c. 15.

[c] The first part of it appeared there in 4. in the year 1548, containing the four Gospels, the Apocalypse, then the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, and last of all the Acts of the Apostles. In the following year, 1549, the remaining thirteen Epistles of Paul appeared as a second part. It has been objected to this edition, that it is any thing but correct. Afterwards were singly edited, S. Johannis Apostoli et Evangelistæ Epistolæ Catholicæ tres, Arabicè et Æthiopicè, curâ ac industriâ Jo. Georg. Nisselii et Theodori Petræi, Lugd. Bat. 1654. 4. and S. Judæ Apostoli Epistolæ Cathol. versio Arab. et Æthiop. à Jo. Georg. Nisselio et Theod. Petræo. Lugd. Bat. 1654. 4., in which some improvements are said to have been made in the Æthiopic text. The whole of the New Testament again appeared in 1657 in the London Polyglott (for which a MS., faulty and often illegible was used), on the whole by no means better

SECTION XCVIII.

THE text of the four Gospels remains true to no family of MSS.; sometimes it appears to draw near to the Ægyptian emendation, at other times to the Constantinopolitan, and frequently to the third, which we have called the edition of Origen. But we also discover readings of the more ancient times in it, which are to be found in the Codex D., on the margin of the Philoxenian version, or in the versions of the Latins before Jerome. It therefore exhibits the appearance either of several versions being *united* in one copy, which is very possible, since the Abyssinian, with whom Job Ludolf was acquainted, remarked a great difference between our printed books and the MSS. of his native country, or several MSS. of different recensions were quoted in the composition of this version.

It cannot be denied, that frequently various readings of two different descriptions have been combined into one: as in Luke vi. 48., where some Documents after σαλευσαι αὐτην instead of τεθεμελιωτο γαρ ἐπι την πετραν read δια το καλως οἰκοδομεῖσθαι αὐτην, but others τεθεμελιωτο γαρ καλως: the two are thus united, τεθεμελιωτο γαρ καλως, δια το καλως οἰκοδομεισθαι αὐτην. In Luke ix. 5. some read for και ἐκειθεν ἐξερχεσθε the contrary, και ἐκειθεν μη ἐξερχεσθε, others, ἑως ἐξερχεσθε, the Æthiopic translator reads και ἐκειθεν μη ἐξερχεσθε, ἑως ἐξερχεσθε. In Luke ix. 35., the

than the preceding edition, or as Ludolf says, retentis mendis veteribus et novis superadditis. The fidelity also of the Latin version is not much commended.

Constantinopolitan MSS. are in favour of ὁ υἱος μου ὁ ἀγαπητος, the Ægyptian of ὁ υἱος μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμενος: but both are in this version. In Luke xi. 13. some read ἀγαθον δομα for Πνευμα ἁγιον: this version has ἀγαθον δομα Πνευματος ἁγιου. In John vi. 69. the Ægyptian recension has συ εἰ ὁ ἁγιος του Θεου, the Constantinopolitan συ εἰ ὁ Χριστος ὁ υἱος του Θεου ζωντος, the Æthiopic συ εἰ ὁ Χριστος, ὁ ἁγιος υἱος του Θεον ζωντος. In John xii. 28. δυξασον σου το ὀνομα, others read δοξασον σου τον υἱον—this version δοξασον σου το ὀνομα, και τον υἱον σου, &c. I believe that we have no occasion to accumulate proofs to convince us, that the text of the Gospels is compounded of different materials.

The Acts of the Apostles have been the most unlucky to the editors. They had only a very defective copy of them, and were frequently obliged for the sake of filling up the gaps, to translate some parts into Æthiopic: this they commonly did from the Vulgate, of which they made no secret. Thus in the Epilogus of the Acts of the Apostles, they have admitted: "ista Acta Apostolorum maximam partem Romæ translata sunt è linguâ Latinâ et Græcâ in Æthiopicam propter defectum Protographi [d]."

That a Greek copy of the Gospels was in the possession of the translator, we have proofs in the permutations and errors, which occur in them. In Matt. iv. 13. he takes ἐν ὁριοις for ἐν ὀρεσι or ἐν ὀρει on the mountain of Zabulon. In Mark ii. 23. he explains the phrase ὁδον ποιειν *to prepare the way*, instead of *to wander, to go*: in Mark viii. 3. he accounts ἀποδοκιμαζειν synonymous with δοκιμαζειν; not comprehending the expression ἐφημερια (Luke i. 5.) he translates it ἐξ ἐφημεριας Ἀβια, as if it were

[d] Walton, Prolegom. xv. Ludolph. Comm. in Hist. Æthiop. L. iii. c. 4. p. 297.

ἐν ἡμέραις Ἀβια, but in the 8th verse, he has entirely omitted it.

The Epistles of Paul recognize a Greek original, as I argue from a very ridiculous mistake in the translation. In 1 Cor. xii. 28. the passage και ους μεν εθετο is thus rendered, "God placed *an ear* in the Church," &c. which could only have arisen from misinterpeting ους for ους.

But, their text, as well as that of the Catholic Epistles, remains tolerably true to the Egyptian recension, as we might expect from the situation of the country and the Ecclesiastical connexion.

The Apocalypse also follows the same recension. This version, venerable for its age, valuable on account of the text, which it follows, assuredly merited a greater attention, and a new edition founded on good MSS., to furnish which the English Bible Society is peculiarly qualified.

ARABIC VERSION.

SECTION XCIX.

Up to the 96th year of the Hejra, the 715th of the Christian æra, at the death of Alwalid, the son of Abd'elmelek, the Arabs had already conquered the East, brought Egypt and the whole northern coast of Africa under their dominion, and founded a kingdom in Spain. With their victories they also extended their language in all three quarters of the world.

The Christians in Asia and Africa, who had addicted themselves to the doctrines of the Nestorians and Monophysites, had under the dominion of the Khalifs a less hard fate than the rest of their bre-

thren. Both retained their Patriarchs, one of whom had his seat at Antioch, the other at Alexandria, as the Head of the Churches in Egypt and Africa. In Spain, they indeed caused some disturbances, without however injuring Christianity on the whole.

In proportion, as the language of the conquerors gained the upper hand, so much the more necessary to the Christians were Arabic versions of their sacred books. Alwalid Ibn Abd'elmelek gave the strongest impulse to it, since in all public transactions of the Christian Delegates, he permitted the use of no tongue but the Arabic [e].

THE ARABIC VERSION FROM THE LATIN.

SECTION C.

THE result was soon experienced. Alwalid had not been very long dead, ere towards the middle of the eighth century, the sacred books of the Old and New Testament were in Spain obliged to be translated into Arabic. The age and author of this version alone are known of all the Arabic versions. For, it was John, Bishop of Seville, who, as the Latin tongue gradually became more and more forgotten, undertook this task for the use of the Christians, and as he also hoped, for that of the Moors [f].

As we may easily conceive, it sprang from the

[e] Gregor. Ab'ulpharagii Histor. Dynast. Dyn. vii. p. 201.—Arabic text.

[f] Mariana de Reb. Hisp. L. vii. c. 3. Joannes Hispalensis Præsul Divinos libros linguâ Arabicâ donabat utriusque nationis saluti consulens; quoniam Arabicæ linguæ multus usus erat Christianis æquè atque Mauris; Latina passim ignorabatur. Ejus interpretationis exempla ad nostram ætatem conservata sunt, extantque non uno in loco in Hispaniâ.

Latin text, and indeed from that of Jerome, which was generally received in Spain in the 7th century. Its critical use, therefore, chiefly would consist in the capability of quoting it to restore the edition of Jerome. The Jesuit Mariana saw in his days several copies of it still in MS.

THE ARABIC VERSION FROM THE SYRIAC.

SECTION CI.

The Syrians under the Patriarchate of Antioch experienced no less the want of an Arabic version. It was prepared from the Peschito. Thomas *Von* Erpe has published in his Arabic edition of the New Testament the Acts of the Apostles, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles according to this version[s]. As to the Gospels, he found in his MS. another text.

[s] He published it from a MS. in the Library at Leyden, ex elegantissimo Bibliothecæ nostræ Codice, manû exarato in monasterio S. Joannis, in Thebaidos deserto, anno aeræ Diocletiani.... 1059. i. e. Christi 1342. In the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles he received from Franz Rapheleng collations from another MS. It first appeared in the form of a specimen, Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos Epistola, Arabicè. Ex Bibliothecâ Leidensi. Leidæ in Typographiâ Erpenianâ ling. Or. 1615-4. Though not mentioned in the title-page, the Epistle to the Galatians was edited with it. In the following year, the whole New Testament appeared. Novum D. N. J. Christi Testamentum Arabicè ex Bibliothecâ Leidensi, edente Thomâ Erpenio. Leidæ in Typ. ling. Or. A. 1616. 4. The MS., from which Rapheleng communicated collations to Erpenius, was probably the same, as that from whence the Epistle to Titus was printed in Rapheleng's press some years before. D. Pauli Apost. Epistola ad Titum, Arabicè, cum Joann. Antonidæ Alcmariani interlineari Versione Lat. ad verbum, ex officinâ Plantinianâ Raphelengii. 1612. 4. Like that of Erpenius, its text is from the Syriac. The editor had a transcript of it from an Oxford Codex, as he says in the preface, which Joseph Abudacni made.

The Acts of the Apostles carry the most evident traces of their origin: τον μεν πρωτον λογον εποιησαμεν the Peschito renders ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܥܒܕܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܕܐ Ar. Erp. اولا قد كتبت كتبا—και νεφελη υπελαβεν αυτον απο των οφθαλμων αυτων, Acts i. 9. ܘܩܒܠܬܗ ܥܢܐ ܬܘ ܬܘܪܝ—ܘܡܢ ܥܝܢܘܗܝ ; και ιδου ανδρες δυο. Acts i. 10. ܗܐ ܓܒܪܐ ; وجد رجلان—ὁ ἐστιν ἐγγυς, i. 12. ܩܪܝܒ ܠܐ ; و هو الي جانب—ὀχλος ὀνοματων. i. 16. ܩܗܠܐ—محفل اناس ; και πρηνης γενομενος, i. 18. ܘܢܦܠ ܐܦ ܠܐ ; وسقط علي وجههُ علي الارض—τη ιδια διαλεκτῳ αυτων, i. 19. ܐܬܕܝ—بلغة اهل البلد—τουτ' ἐστι—ܕܗܝ ; الذي ترجمتهُ. We may be satisfied with these examples, which are taken from the first chapter, since there is no need of a careful reading or collation of passages scattered here and there, to prove how closely the Arabic text repeats each turn and expression of the Peschito.

The case is the same with Paul's epistles likewise. We will merely adduce a few passages from the beginning of that to the Hebrews: τῳ ῥηματι της δυναμεως αυτου. i. 3. ܒܟܠܡܗ—بقوة كلمتهُ—δι' ἑαυτου καθαρ· ·—باقنومهُ—ii. 2. δι' ἀγγελων, ܒܐܝܕ ܡܠܐܟܐ—علي ايدي الملئكة—και πασα παραβασις και παρακοη ἐλαβεν ἐνδικον μισθαποδοσιαν, ܘܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܕܫܡܥ ܘܥܒܪ ; وكل من سمعها وتعداها عوقب بالعدل—τηλικαυτης ἀμελησαντες σωτηριας. ii. 3. ܐܝ ܗܟܢܐ ; ان تهاونا بالامور التي هي حياتنا—κατα την

αὐτου θελησιν. ii. 4. ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ܒܗ ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ?—التي نالوها: كمثبتة διεμαρτυρατο που τις. ii. 6. ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ?ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ܒܗ ܐܝ—أنا اهب كما شهد الكتب, &c. &c.

There are also, as we may expect, evidences, that the translator executed his labours from MSS. of the Nestorians [b].

The Epistle of James, the first of Peter and John are in like manner rendered according to the Peschito. But the remaining Catholic Epistles, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and that of Jude, which were from other sources added to the Peschito, have no relation or a very indirect one, to the Arabic of Erpenius. Among other characteristics, for example, the Syrian translator in Jude 6th ver. rendered δεσμοις ἀϊδιοις by *unknown chains*—at ver. 12. instead of ἀγαπαις he read the word ἀργιαις (ΑΓΑΠΑΙΣ-ΑΡΓΙΑΙΣ) and conceived ἐκριζωθεντα to have been *a tree twice plucked up by the roots*, of all which, and of other peculiarities, we have no trace in our Arabic version.

I only find one instance in this Epistle, where they agree in a remarkable reading: for both have transformed at ver. 11. ἐξεκενωθησαν into ἐξεκαυθησαν. In like manner I have observed throughout in the second of Peter, the second and third of John, a striking independence between the two versions, and very seldom have found any thing, which approximates them to each other; of which a third Syriac text known to both, or a Gloss, of which several have crept into Erpenius's MSS., may have been the cause.

Nevertheless, Erpenius's Arabic text in these pas-

[b] Adler, Novi Testamenti versiones Syriacæ, simplex, &c. denuo examinatæ, L. i. p. 36, 37.

sages departs so far from the stronger sense of the Greek expression, that it will be readily admitted, that the Translator did not immediately see the Greek, but that he made use of some medium, consequently, that his translation is less forcible and less definite. Hence is it probable, that these Epistles were translated into Arabic from some hitherto undiscovered Syriac version [1].

The Apocalypse in Erpenius's edition is a version essentially different from that in the Polyglott. Yet, occasionally, we find such similarities between both, that we cannot controvert the hypothesis, that one of the two translators was acquainted with the work of the other. The Syriac Apocalypse, which is found at the end of the Peschito, was not the source, from whence this Arabic version flowed; thus much may we easily observe from a collation; but to name the identical source, were now no easy task.

SECTION CII.

We have before agitated the question respecting the four Gospels, not entirely for the purpose of rejecting them, but for the sake of devoting our attention to them in a more appropriate place. Erpenius had, as we have observed, other Gospels in his MS., which in no way recognize the old Syriac version as their source. As the subscription found at the end assures us, they are translations from the Coptic, or rather were revised by Nesiulaman a Copt, the son of Azalkefat.

[1] This text of the Catholic Epistles was reprinted in Johannis Epistolæ Catholicæ Arab. et Æthiop. Lugd. Bat. 1654. 4. Jacobi Epistola Arab. et Æthiop. et Judæ Ep. Arab. Æthiop. in the same year and place. Cf. Schnurrer, Biblioth. Arab. P. vi. p. 26.

The addition of Gospels, belonging to another version, to this Syro-Arabic New Testament, may be deemed an accidental circumstance; yet, is it worthy of remark, that an Arabic MS. of the New Testament, Codd. Or. N. 43. in the Royal Library at Vienna, in which the Epistles are translated from the Peschito, as the surviving fragments shew, contains the Gospels not according to the Syriac, but exactly like those, which Erpenius found in the Codex at Leyden.

A Parisian MS. exhibits to us the ancient Syriac text of the Gospels, with an Arabic version by the side; here, then, we might expect an Arabic translation, according to the Peschito. The scholar [k] who has discussed and accurately described this document, thought, indeed, at first, that he had *discovered* an Arabic version, which essentially differed from the preceding, but after a closer investigation he rejected his assertion, and afterwards declared, that these Gospels only varied from the printed text in various readings and accidental differences [l].

These appearances are at least no agreeable omens in favour of the conjectural existence *of an Arabic version of the Gospels from the Syriac text*: I believe in fact, that no such has ever existed [m].

[k] Gottl. Christian Storr Obss. super N. T. versionibus Syriacis. Stuttgard, 1772. 8. P. i. § 12. p. 21.

[l] Idem, Dissert. inaugural. critica de Evangeliis Arabicis, Tubingæ, 1775. 4. § 26. p. 37.

[m] Richard Simon gives us in his histoire critique des versions du N. T. ch. 18. an account of a Syriac and Arabic MS. of the four Gospels, which (Numb. 285. Cod. Syr.) is in the Bibliotheque du Roi at Paris. Yet he says, that the copyist has transcribed the Arabic no farther than a few sections at the beginning. The Syriac Gospels with the preceding number are also found in the National Library, and are marked according to the more recent arrangement Codd. Syr. N. 16. But we cannot there see any trace of an Arabic version; but we find a prefatory history in Arabic of one Peter of

In this I am considerably confirmed by the *Karshuni* New Testament. It is well known, that the Syrians very long preserved their national characters, or rather that they did not receive those transformations, which their characters suffered under the hands of the Arabs. Notwithstanding, they had read for a long time the Bible in the Arabic version, they wrote it, like other Church-documents, in Syriac characters, and even now many adhere to this custom. Such MSS., from whatever the name may be derived, are called Karshuni.

Now, if the Syrian Church ever possessed a peculiar Arabic version of the Gospels, we must seek it in those books, which are written in their Ecclesiastical character, and appear in the rank of their Church-documents. Whoever under this idea opens the Karshuni New Testament, which was printed at Rome for the use of the Maronites [n], at the Propaganda-press, must be very much perplexed in again meeting here Erpenius's text. And it is really the case, as I have convinced myself by a collation of several chapters in Mark.

The MS., which the editors followed, was brought from Cyprus to Rome by Michael Metoscita. They had several in their possession, as they acknowledge

Aleppo having revised the MS. in the year 1671. Simon seems in his precipitation in favour of the Arabic, *vis à vis des premières sections*, to have considered this as belonging to the Syriac text.

[n] This book has been above described (N. 15.) among the editions of the Peschito. I saw it first in the Royal Library at Vienna, and afterwards obtained it at Rome. One column of the page contains the text of the Peschito, the other the Karshuni. It is understood to express in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles the Arabic version, which proceeded from the Syriac. Also, in the 2nd of Peter, the 2nd and 3rd of John, and the Epistle of Jude, the text agrees with that of Erpenius, also in the Apocalypse, although it abounds in more frequent variations.

in the preface. but they gave the preference to this, on account of its correctness [o]. Nearly a hundred years before, the excellent John Baptist Raimundi had, as it seems, resolved to edite a Karshuni New Testament. At least he caused three MSS., which were in the college of the Maronites, to be fairly transcribed: these preparatory labours and the MSS. themselves, on which they were founded, doubtless were in the possession of those, to whom the Propaganda entrusted this employment [p].

I conceive this induction sufficiently important to justify me, in plainly contradicting the existence of an Arabic version of the Gospels from the *Peschito*. Even the very fact, which may be opposed to me, is favourable to my opinion. The Library at *Leyden* preserves a Codex, which contains the commentaries of Ab'ulfaraj Abdallaz Ben Al Thib on Matthew. The text of Matthew, on which the commentary is made, is really translated from the Syriac: here therefore is an Arabic Gospel from the Peschito. Be it so:—yet the scholar, who has informed us of this phænomenon, at the same time states, that this version, as well from the manner of its execution, as from the commentary which accompanies it, was evidently composed by the commentator himself, who lived in the 11th century. Up to this period, therefore, no Arabic Gospels existed from the Syriac: —otherwise indeed, the Commentator would not have been under the necessity of composing a translation of them [q].

[o] Præf. ad N. T. Carsh. et hanc (versionem) quæ in præsenti Syriacis characteribus in lucem prodit, Romam detulit ex Cypri insulâ Michael Metoscita, quæ cæteris, quas præ manibus habuimus, correctior est et emendatior.

[p] Lami de Erudit. Apostol. P. ii. Sect. iii. § 1. p. 883—885.

[q] Gottl. Christian Storr. Diss. inaug. Crit. de Evang. Arab. § 34. p. 43, 44.

idea: I here present the Epistle to
specimen and an acceptable present (
friends of Biblical literature, from
convince themselves of my assertion

وع المسيح وظموتاوس الاخ الي فيلمون حبيبنا
2. وافيا الاخت وارخيفوس شريكنا في معبدية
لنعمة لكم والسلامة من الله ابينا ومن ربنا يسوع
ر اللهي في كل حين واذكرك في صلواتي 4. اذ
تك وامانتك هذه التي لك في يسوع المسيح
6. لكي تكون شركة امانتك تعمل في معرفة
نا الي المسيح 7. اني نلت فرح عظيم وعزآ
الاظهار استراح من حبتك ايها الاخ 8. من
عظيم بالرب ان امرك بما يجب 9. من
للب اليك وانا واحد هكذا بولس الشيخ والسير
الآن اطلب اليك من اجل هذا الذي ولدته في
11. هذا الذي كان غير بافعالك زمانا والا هو
هذا الذي ارسلتهُ اليك فاقبلهُ انت الذي هو
ريد ان امسكهُ عندي لكي يخدمني عوضك في
وبغير رايك لم اريد افعل شي لكي لا تكون
برعية القلب 15. ولعله من اجل هذا افترق

Vers. 2. Others read αγαπητῃ; but ADEFG, ar
Verse 6. Others read ἐν ἡμιν; but AC. Vat. 121
Ἰησουν is omitted, as in AC. and the Coptic.
and Copt.: others read χαριν. Verse 14. ن
pression occurs in Apoc. xii. 14., in the Arabic
glott, and likewise in John vi. 44., where the roo
to drag.

جبذ is more frequently written جذب per
passage of John; but it is by no means a root o
TRANSLATOR.

منك حيناً فلكي تقباه دايماً .16 وليس مثل عبد بل مثل اخ
حبيب فاضل عن عبد ولا سيما لي وكم بالحري لك .17 وبالجسد
وبالربّ فان كان قد ساعدك فمن العبيب اقبلهُ هكذا .18 وان
كان قد ظلبك بشي اولك يجب هذا أحسبهُ عليَّ .19 انا بولس
كتبتُ بيدي وايضاً اوفي ليلاً اقول لك انهُ يجب عليك ان تبدل
نفسك لي .20 نعم يا اخي انا مستريح القلب بك في الربّ
نيح حبّتي في المسيح .21 وقلبي واثق في طاعتك كتبت لك
وانا اعلم انك تريد علي ما اقول .22 ومع هذا تهيي لي منزلاً
لاني ارجو ان بصلاتكم اوهب اليكم .23 يُسلم عليكم افافراس شريكي
في السبي بيسوع المسيح ومرقوس وارسطرخس ودماس ولوقا شركاي
في العمل نعمة ربّنا يسوع لمسيح مع ارواحكم

This version, which, like the Syro-Arabic, is not made according to the Greek text, cannot be admitted in decision of the readings of the Greek text: but, though it may be superfluous information to the critic, the Coptico-Arabic version can only serve for this purpose, where doubts exist as to the readings of the Coptic text, in the same manner as the Syro-Arabic can only decide for those of the Peschito. Were we once critically to investigate and fresh edite the Peschito or the Coptic versions in a manner worthy of them, both the one and the other Arabic version would be found very valuable aids to such an undertaking.

Verse 17. The Arab here appears to have read *εἰ οὖν αὐτον ἐχειν κοινωνον*, or else not to have well understood his original. The word جيب means the upper border of the under-garment:— hence, a friendly disposed person, an intimate friend is allegorically called ناصح الجيب, in which sense the phrase العبيب appears to occur here.

A FURTHER INQUIRY INTO THE GOSPELS IN PARTICULAR.

SECTION CIV.

THE Syrians had no other Arabic Gospels than those which Erpenius has published, as we have before proved with many arguments. But the Copts also had them, as the Vatican MS. assures us. The MS. which Erpenius followed, was also really corrected by a Copt, which the subscription thus attests at the end of the Gospels. Absoluta est hujus libri descriptio die 16 mensis Baunæ, anni nongentissimi octogesimi octavi Martyrum Justorum. Descriptus autem est Codex ex emendatissimo exemplari, cujus descriptor ait, se id descripsisse ex alio exemplari emendato, exarato manû Johannis Episcopi Cophitæ, qui Johannes dicit, se suum descripsisse ex exemplari emendatissimo, quod ediderat D. Nesinlaman F. Azalkefati.

Nevertheless, these Gospels are neither translated from the Coptic nor from the Syriac, but recognize the Greek text as their source. This we may partly notice from the position of the words, which, as far as possible, is preserved according to the Greek, even in those arrangements of construction or transpositions of words and parts of speech, where the Arabic Syntax adopts a totally different custom. Likewise, from the etymologies, which the author has often attempted too carefully to follow, as, *e. g.* in the words τετραρχης, which, particularly in Luke iii. 1., produces a bad effect, διχοτομησει, Matt. xxiv. 51.

ὑπερηφανια, Mark vii. 22. εὐσχημων, Mark xv. 43. συμφωνια, Luke xv. 25., πολιτης, Luke xv. 15., which the Translator derived from πολυς, and rendered عظيم. This is still further proved by the false separations of words, the erroneous division of passages, and the change of expressions, as Matt. xxii. 4. where he read ΚΑΙΑΣΙΤΙΣΤΑ for ΚΑΤΑΣΙΤΙΣΤΟΙ in one word, Mark iv. 9. where he analyzed ΕΙΣΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΙ into ΟΙΣ or ΑΙΣ ΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΙ, or Matt. xxv. 21. where he thus managed the construction, δουλε ἀγαθε, και πιστος ἐπι ὀλιγα ἠς, πιστον ἐπι πολλων σε καταστησω, Matt. xxiii. 24. where he mistook ΔΙΑΛΙΠΟΝΤΕΣ τον κωνωπα for ΔΙΥΛΙΖΟΝΤΕΣ.

This translation of the Gospels from the Greek was (as we have seen) received by the Syrians as the Church-version, and to this end was so far brought into agreement with their older Church-version, the Peschito, as to be capable of appearing by the side of it in MSS., and to be accounted a Syro-Arabic text.

A like honour and a like fate happened to it among the Copts, for it was forcibly modified so to suit their authorized Church-version, that in readings and peculiarities it might not at least strikingly contradict it.

We know not who executed or revised the Arabico-Coptic text: it might have been Nesiulaman, the son of Azalkefat, whose services to the text were in Ægypt formerly better known than now, since we are only very inaccurately informed of them merely by the subscription of the Leyden Codex. With respect to the Arabico-Syriac Gospels an account was in circulation among the Syrians, which mentions to us at least the time, when they might be desired. John, Patriarch of the Jacobites, is said to have been called upon about the year 640 of our era, even by an

Arab magistrate of this province, to translate the four Gospels from the Syriac into Arabic[r]. Therefore the modification of these Gospels according to the Peschito might have been undertaken under this Patriarch.

Since, then, no peculiar version of the Gospels was prepared for both Churches, but only one in existence, which was made from the Greek, they so altered and accommodated it, that it resembled the Coptic and Syriac version, and might be placed by their side; whence, it is very probable, that these Arabic Gospels are of older origin, and were long before regarded and esteemed. We therefore have in them a far more venerable monument, than we ordinarily think.

These more ancient Gospels, which were made from a Greek copy (difficult, as it is in their present state, accurately to determine which recension they follow), certainly did not proceed from a MS. of the Hesychian or Ægyptian text. So far can we assert with safety from a view of the whole. Yet Arabia proper, *Jezirat el Arab*, may be said to have received its books and Christianity from Ægypt.

We are therefore induced to seek the origin of this version or its first situation, elsewhere than in the Arabian peninsula, viz. among those Arabs who lived under petty kings in the south and north-east of Palestine. These, whom the Greek writers call Saracens, were persuaded by negociations from Constantinople, in consequence of a war under Valens, in the second half of the fourth century, to adopt Christianity[s]. The Christian teachers now certainly deemed Arabic Gospels necessary, which were trans-

[r] Asseman. Bibl. Orient. T. iii. p. ii. p. 599.

[s] Socrat. Hist. Eccl. iv. 36. Theod. Hist. Eccl. iv. 23. Sozomen vi. 39.

lated from Constantinopolitan or Palæstinian MSS. like those which are the basis of our text.

Notwithstanding, every one is at liberty to adopt or reject my hypotheses as to the time and place, when and where these Gospels originated, yet, must it be conceded, that they were in existence, when the Syrians and Copts experienced the want of an Arabic translation of the Bible. Should any one still further ask me, why these two Churches did not proceed in the same manner with regard to the remaining books of the New Testament, and adapt an older Arabic version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles to the Peschito or the Coptic text, among several replies I could give the shortest, that none but the Gospels were translated. To this it might yet be rejoined, that both phenomena are still there at the same time, and both are correct: thus no one can answer all the questions which might be made on the subject.

THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS.

SECTION CV.

HENCE originated three different books of the Gospels, which in fact contained only one version. This, however, was not beneficial to the text, for the transcribers, who were necessitated, more in the Arabic than in the rest, to collate several copies, by degrees threw all three together. Naturally, they had no idea of correcting the one from the other, or of receiving the variations from one copy into the other, because they perceived in the main only one translation in all. Hence, little by little, a mixed text arose.

This particularly happened in Matthew; even at the beginning, where the ardour of the copyists was less cooled. The MS. which the Roman editions of the Arabic Gospels in 1591 followed, differed from the Leyden Codex and the others, which Erpenius used, as he has remarked in the preface to his New Testament, more especially in the thirteen first chapters of Matthew. I myself possess a very neat MS. of the Arabic Gospels in 16, which even proceeds in some following chapters of this Evangelist, to make strong deviations in several passages.

A MS. of the Gospels, which is marked No. xxvii. in the Bibliotheque du Roi, in great octavo, recedes more in some chapters of Matthew, which I have collated, from Erpenius's text, than in Luke. *It is* still valuable in this point of view, since it certifies us of the conduct of the Arabic transcribers, and of the want of consideration, with which they have thrown all together. For the copyist says, in a postscript at the end, that he has delivered here a correct MS. which he had revised and emended by a collation of the best SYRIAC, RUMI, COPTIC, and ARABIC COPIES. These are his words:

النسخة محررة علي عدّة نسخ كريمة سريانية ورومية وقبطيّة وعربيّة واعتمدت حقارتنا من النسخ لمذكورة علي ما ثبت صحّته وترك منها ما ثبت سقمه. &c.

He then further confirms his assertions by examples, which it is not necessary here to quote.

A MS. in the Royal Library at Vienna, Codd. Or. N. 43., which formerly appears to have contained the whole New Testament, of which, however, except the Gospels, only some fragments of the two Epistles to the Corinthians remain, evidently shows to us this conduct. Lambeccius has criticized it in the first

book of his commentary, under N. 34. Peter Kirsten has compiled from it his *Notæ in Evangelium Matthæi* (Breslæ. 1611.)

The Gospels of this MS. are surrounded above the lines and on the margin, with numerous various readings, the sources of which, *(one MS.—another,* or *the Coptic, the Syrian, the Rumi,* in red ink, although it is uncertain whether the Greeks or Latins are intended by this last term) are generally marked. Near them continually stands a diacritical sign, which refers these remarks to the word or passage, to which they have relation. But the value of this precious document does not only consist in representing to us the undertaking of the transcribers, as they extracted the readings from all the copies, and of their fellow-labourers, who improvidently placed together very heterogeneous materials, which were frequently melted down by them into one mass.

Its peculiar merit consists in its tendency to preserve him hereafter from despair, who shall resolve to disentangle the older Arabic Gospels from the snarl in which they lie, to separate the foreign matter from them, and to restore them to their original state. For this laborious task this MS. will present to him heterogeneous materials, will name its sources, and guide the critical execution of the undertaking.

EDITIONS OF THE GOSPELS.

SECTION CVI.

We have already spoken only of Erpenius's text of the Gospels; but they were much earlier printed at Rome in the year 1590, we know not from wh[redacted]

with the title: Evangelium Sanctum Domini nostri Jesu Christi conscriptum à quatuor Evangelistis Sanctis, id est, à Matthæo, Marco, Lucâ, et Johanne. Romæ in Typographiâ Mediceâ MDXC. fol. At the end, the date MDXCI. stands. In the same year, they again appeared with a Latin interlineary text from the same press: some copies having the title, Sanctum Dei Evangelium Arab. Lat., some having none. In the last page but one, the printer (Typographus Lectori) gives an account of the emendations, which he had made in this edition. Under this subscription stand the words, Romæ in Typographiâ Mediceâ, MDXCI. This (the Arabico-Latin edition) was offered for sale as a new work [t] in the year MDCXIX. with a new title, and in the year *1774* a second time, ornamented with a similar.

According to the second Roman edition the Gospels were inserted in the Parisian Polyglott in the year 1645, with some alterations of Sionita [u].

Walton from his own confession took the text from the Parisian Polyglott, which is to be found in the 5th part of the London Polyglott [x].

In consequence of this derivation of the editions we have properly three principal impressions, which immediately proceeded from MSS.—the Roman, the Erpenian, and the Karshuni. Concerning the agreement of the Roman and Erpenian text a little work

[t] The history and description of these editions have been carefully given in Christ. Fr. Schnurrer, Bibl. Ar. P. vi. Tubing. 1805-4., and afterwards, in his larger work, Bibliotheca Arabica Halæ, 1811. 8 class, v. n. 318.

[u] This we partly know from the printer of this Polyglott, è scripto Antonii Vitré in Gabrielem Sionitam anno 1640 Parisiis excuso, which Le Long has quoted in his description of this Polyglott—partly we know it from Richard Simon, histoire critique des versions du N. T. c. 8.

[x] Walton Proleg. v. § 4. n. 9., xiv. § 17. p. 35 and 96.

first informed us, which has contributed much to the better knowledge of the Arabic Gospels [y].

THE ARABIC ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, THE EPISTLES, AND APOCALYPSE IN THE POLYGLOTTS.

SECTION CVII.

We do not know, whence the editors of the Parisian Polyglott have taken these parts, unless perchance they were published by the before-named printer, Antony Vitré. By him we are informed, that the MS., from which they are edited, came from Aleppo [z].

Nevertheless, they are immediately translated from the Greek, as several phenomena shew, which could only have hence arisen, *e. g.* Acts xix. 9. where a man named Tyrannus is mentioned, the Translator renders Τυραννου τινος احد الكبرا: Acts ii. 20. ἐπαυλις αὐτου he mistook for ἡ πολις αὐτου مدينته: Acts xii. 13. he translates the proper name Ῥοδη, ܪܘܕܐ: Acts xxi. 1. he read ΕΙΣΠΑΤΑΡΑ—εἰς σπαρτα; Acts xxviii. 11. ἐν πλοιῳ παρακεχειμακοτι ἐν τῃ νησῳ, Ἀλεξανδρινῳ παρασημῳ Διοσκουροις, he thus renders, *with a ship which had wintered there, belonging to an Alexandrian of the name of Dioscorides.* Instances, where the Greek has been falsely divided or interpunctuated, occur. In Acts xv. 17. ὁ ποιων ταυτα παντα γνωστα is read to-

[y] Dissert. inaug. crit. de Evangeliis Arabicis. Auct. Gottlob Christ. Storr, Tubingæ. 1775. 4.

[z] These are the words in Le Long's extract. Arabici textûs quatuor Evangelia cum Latinâ translatione juxta Romanum exemplar. A. 1591. et reliqua N. T. ex codice MS^to. quem ex Aleppo adduci curaverat R. P. Joseph Carmelita, adornata sunt.

gether, and the following clause begins, ἀπ' αἰωνος ἐστι τῳ Θεῳ. π. τ. ε. α. From the beginning the Deity's own works belonged to him. In Acts xix. 35, 36. the first clause ends with Ἀρτεμιδος, and και του διωπετους is joined to ἀναντιῤῥητων, and rendered, "*even if we had fallen down from heaven, we could not contradict this.*" In Acts xx. 15. ἐν Τρωγυλλιῳ τῃ ἐχομενῃ is joined together, and interpreted, "*lay near at Trogyllium.*" The interpretations of xix. 24. Ἀρτεμις—xiv. 2. Ζευς, and Ἑρμης—الزهرة—عطارد—المشترب and several others pre-suppose, that the composer saw the Greek words.

Such also is the case in the Epistles: in 2 Cor. vi. 14. μη γινεσθε ἑτεροζυγουντες τοις ἀπιστοις there is a neat etymology of ἑτεροζυγειν, *your scales should not incline towards the unbelievers.* A similar also is in 2 Cor. vi. 5. ἐν ἀκαταστασιαις, *in want of a place in which to lodge ourselves;* Gal. vi. 25. συστοιχει τῃ Ἱερουσαλημ *it borders on Jerusalem,* is more mistaken. The phrase κατα ἀνθρωπον, 1 Cor. xv. 32, is very falsely interpreted, *as it is suitable to a man,* &c. In 2 Cor. x. 16. ὑπερκεινα is interchanged with ὑπερκειμενα, and ἑτοιμα with ἐντιμα, and in the preceding verse τοποις is mistaken for κοποις. Κοποις is indeed also in the text, but it came into it from another quarter, and all the mistakes in the words ὑπερκεινα and ἑτοιμα partly originated from τοποις, and thus, ὑπερκειμενα and ἐντιμα have been rendered, *lands lying higher than your's and valuable places.* In 2 Cor. x. 13. κατα το μετρον του κανονος the Greek word κανων itself is retained, قانون كمقدر. In the Epistle of Jude v. 12. οὑτοι εἰσιν ἐν ταις ἀγαπαις αὐτων σπιλαδες, συνευοχουμενοι—ἀγαπαι are taken for love-partners or prostitutes, as if the Translator had read ἀγαπηταις, and συνευοχουμενοι is cautiously expressed by three words, "*These are they,* WHO PLACE

their impure prostitutes WITH THEM AT ENTERTAINMENTS." In Apoc. ii. 5. ἐργα των Νικολαιτων are rendered *the words of the conquerors,* افعال الفتاك. In xvi. 9. ΘΥΜΟΥ is confounded with ΘΑΝΑΤΟΥ, which is much more easy, if we conceive the last word abbreviated, ΘΝΤΟΥ, as is the case in MSS.

SECTION CVIII.

THESE passages are from a Translator totally different to him, from whom we have the Gospels. The phraseology considerably differs in very many respects: I will at least give one proof, as to the use of particular words. In the Gospels, for ἐξεστι or οὐκ ἐξεστι, the phrase always is, كان تحلّ or ما كان يحلّ Matt. xii. 2. 10.; xiv. 4.; xix. 3.; Mark ii. 24.; iii. 4.; x. 2.; xii. 14.; Luke vi. 2. 4., &c. This is not found in the Acts of the Apostles nor in the Epistles, where the expression is commonly مطلق or ممكن Acts xxii. 25.; xxi. 37.; ii. 29.; 1 Cor. vi. 12.; x. 23.; 2 Cor. xii. 4. Ἑκατονταρχος is always in the Gospels قايد المائة, Matt. viii. 5. 8.; xiii. 27.; Luke vii. 2. 6., and in the Acts of the Apostles, رييس المائة x. 1. 22.; xxiv. 23.; xxvii. 31. In the Acts of the Apostles,

[a] Hug here evidently conceives the Arabic Translator to have attempted a translation of Νικολαιτων. This however is doubtful, because الفتاك would not suit his purpose, and cannot signify *Conquerors,* as he suggests. *Procaces,* as in the Latin explanation of the Arabic version, far better expresses its sense *in this passage,* and it is probable, that in the selection of this word, he had more regard to the prevalent character of the Heretics, than to any conjectural derivation of their name.—TRANSLATOR.

στρατηγος του ιερου is امير الهيكل, in the Gospels; حند الهيكل. In the Gospels βιβλος is always سفر or كتاب, in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles it is مصحف the word applied by Abubekr to the Koraun: Acts i. 20.; vii. 42.; xix. 19.; Gal. iii. 10.; Phil. iv. 3.; Heb. ix. 19. In the Gospels, νομος is always, ناموس, in the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles it is شريعة. Rom. v. 13.; Phil. iii. 6. 9.; 1 Tim. i. 8.; Heb. vii. 12.; James ii. 12.; Acts xv. 24. In the Gospels, Διαβολος is ابليس, in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles المحال Eph. vi. 11.; 2 Tim. ii. 26.; 1 Pet. v. 8.; 1 John iii. 8.; Acts x. 38.; xiii. 10, &c.

However, the Acts of the Apostles, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, as we have already partly seen from the similar use of the already enumerated expressions, are by one and the same Translator. I cannot venture to assert as much of the Apocalypse. The correspondence of phrases, the mode adopted in the translation, the custom of elucidating hard passages by periphrases (Acts xvi. 2.; xvii. 20.; xviii. 15.; 1 Cor. v. 10.; Rom. vi. 5. 16.; xiv. 19., &c.) unite this free style with a scrupulous accuracy, and express with a very particular attention the words compounded with μετα, συν and especially with προ, which last is effected by means of قدم, سلف and frequently سبق: Acts ii. 25. προωρωμην سبقت فرأيت —31. προϊδων سبق فعرف—Rom. i. 2. προεπηγγειλατο, سبق فوعد 2 Pet. iii. 16. προγινωσκοντες سبقتم فعرفتم All these and similar observations, which might be corroborated by numerous examples, indicate one and the same Translator in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles.

But, the text of this version has not remained

free from foreign additions. We often find one and the same word twice translated, short sentences also twice given with other words, which could scarcely have belonged to the original structure of this version, but have been taken and added afterwards from other books. As in Acts xv. 15. 28.; xvi. 37. 39.; xxi. 11. 13. 27. In Acts xviii. 7. ὀνοματι Ἰουστου has been augmented by the name Τιτου, from the Arabico-Syriac version. Or, Rom. vi. 21. 23.; xii. 8.; xiii. 5.; xiv. 20., &c. Among these later interpolations we must also reckon the word الفرنجية, which (Acts xviii. 2.) has been added to Ἰταλιας, and which is very much calculated to embarrass us with regard to this version: but it must be retraced to the times of the Crusades, in which, Europeans in general, with the exception of the Greeks, were called Franks in the East and in Africa. The Apocalypse, concerning which it is very uncertain, whether it was originally a part of this version, is composed from a MS. which was interpolated from the Scholia of Andreas of Cappadocia. Apoc. i. 2—5.; ii. 16.

SECTION CIX.

The author himself has very unexpectedly mentioned the country of this version. In Acts ii., where Luke enumerates the different nations, which were in Jerusalem at the Pentecost, he mentions at verse 9., τα μερη της Λιβυας της κατα Κυρηνην, which this Translator renders افريقية ونواحي التي كورتنا Africa and its territories, which is our country. We now therefore are convinced, that the reading *Al Franjiâ*, which in Acts viii. 2., is added to the word *Italy*, was later intro-

LUCIAN.	HESYCHIUS.
17. ἐμεριϭ. ὁ Θεος	AR. ἐμεριϭ. ὁ Κυριος
κεκληκ. ὁ Κυριος	AR. κεκληκ. ὁ Θεος
22. ὁμοιως και ὁ ἐλευϑ.	AR. ὁμοιως ὁ ἐλευϑ.
34. μεμεριϭται και ἡ γυνη ἡ παρϑενος ἡ ἀγαμος μεριμνᾷ	AR. και μεμεριϭται και ἡ γυνη, ἡ ἀγαμος, και ἡ παρϑενος, ἡ ἀγαμος μεριμνᾷ
37. ἑδραιος ἐν τῃ καρδιᾳ	AR. τῃ καρδιᾳ αὐτοῦ ἑδραιος.

This text, which first appeared in the Parisian Polyglott, was reprinted in Walton's. The edition also of the English Bible Society

(الكتب لمقدسة وهي كتب العهد العتيق والعهد الجديد)

1811. in great 4to. has repeated it, but I do not know, whether the New Testament be furnished with the additional aid of MSS.

SECTION CXI.

THE Arabic edition of the Bible, which is said to have appeared at Bucharest in the year 1700, and another, which Athanasius of Antioch, Patriarch of the Melchites, caused to be printed at Aleppo in the year 1706, for which I have inquired in vain in all the great libraries, which I have visited, are now, as it were, unknown.

The Arabic New Testament, which was edited under the superintendence of Salomo Negri in the year 1727, at London, in 4to. (according to Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, P. 1. § 67. p. 453. 4to. ed.) was printed from the English Polyglott with some alterations according to the Greek text.

In the Vulgar-Greek Chronicle of Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Monembasia (Venice, 1778, 4to.) we

find in a treatise Περι του Σουλταν Μεχμετη, p. 424, *on Mohammed the 2nd, Conqueror of Constantinople*, the account, that Mechmebey, a son of Amuratusi of Trapezunt, translated in the Harem for this Monarch the Bible from the Greek into the Arabic [b]. However interesting this book may be in other points of view, it will little avail our purpose.

An Arabic paraphrase of some pericopes of Paul's Epistles, which is written by the side of the old Syriac text of this Epistle, was found by an illustrious Oriental scholar, in Cod. Syr. Vatic. Num. xxxiii. of which he has published specimens [c].

THE LATIN VERSIONS.

SECTION CXII.

In the period preceding Jerome, several very different Latin versions existed in Africa, Italy and Gaul, of which we may here convince ourselves by some brief extracts. Matt. v. 16. Luceat lumen vestrum coram hominibus, ut videant bona facta vestra, et clarificent Patrem vestrum, qui in cœlis est. *Iren. adv. Hær. L.* iv. *c.* 37. Luceat lumen vestrum coram hominibus, ut videant opera vestra bona, et magnificent Patrem vestrum, qui in cœlis est. *Hilar. Pict. Tract. in Ps.* lxv. Matt. vi. 31. Nolite cogitare dicentes; quid edemus, aut quid bibemus, aut quid vestiemur? hæc enim nationes quærunt. *Cyprian. de orat. Dom.* Nolite soliciti esse, dicentes quid manducabimus, et quid bibemus, aut quo operiemur?

[b] Profr. Alter in the Literary Gazette. 9th P. A. 1799.

[c] Adler Nov. Test. Vers. Syr. denuò exam. &c. Hafniæ—1789. 4—p. 27—30 et 38.

hæc enim omnia gentes inquirunt. *Augustin. de Op. Manich. c.* 1. Matt. xi. 12. A diebus enim Joannis Baptistæ regnum cœlorum cogitur, et cogentes diripiunt illud. *Ambros. L.* vi. *in Lucam c.* 7. *et de Cain et Abel. c.* 4. A diebus autem Joannis regnum cœlorum vim patitur, et vim facientes diripiunt illud. *Hilar. Pict. in Ps.* viii. *n.* 46. *Optat. Milev. de Schism. Donatist. L.* v. *c.* 5. A diebus Joannis regnum cœlorum violentum est, et qui vim faciunt, diripiunt illud. *Iren. L.* iv. *edo. Hær. c.* 37. Luke ix. 62. Nemo tenens manicam aratri, post se attendens, intrabit in regnum cœlorum. *Optat. Milevit. de Schism. Donatist. L.* iii. *c.* 11. Nemo retro respiciens aratrum tenens aptus est regno cœlorum. *Hilar. in Ps.* cxxii. *n.* 4. Luke xxi. 34. Attendite—ne graventur corda vestra cruditate et vinolentiâ et curis secularibus. *August. contra Adimant. Manich. c.* 14. Attendite—ne graventur corda vestra in crapulâ et ebrietate, et solicitudinibus secularibus. *Iren. L.* iv. *c.* 37. *n.* 3.

Acts ii. 8. Accipietis virtutem Spiritû Sancto in vos, et eritis mihi testes in Hierusalem, in omni Judæâ et in Samariâ, usque in fines terræ. *Ambros. de Spir. S. L.* i. *c.* 7. Accipietis virtutem Spirîtûs Sancti supervenientem in vos, et eritis mihi testes apud Hierusalem et in totâ Judæâ et Samariâ et usque ad totam terram. *August. cont. Epist. fund. c.* 9. Acts ii. 2. Et factus est subitò de cœlo sonus, tanquam ferretur flatus vehemens, et implevit totum illum locum, ubi erant sedentes, et visæ sunt ipsis linguæ divisæ quasi ignis. *Aug. loc. cit.* Et factus est subitò de cœlo sonus, tanquam vi magnâ spiritus ferretur, et replevit totam domum, ubi erant sedentes, et visæ sunt ipsis dispersæ linguæ, tanquam ignis. *Ambros. de Sp. S. L.* i. *c.* 16.

Col. i. 15. Qui est imago Dei invisibilis, primogenitus omnis Creaturæ, quia in ipso constituta sunt omnia in cœlis et in terrâ, visibilia et invisibilia, sive

throni, sive principatus, sive potestates, sive Dominationes: omnia per ipsum et in ipso condita sunt. *Hilar. L.* viii. *de Trin. c.* 49. Quia ipse est Imago Dei Invisibilis, primogenitus omnis Creaturæ, in quo creata sunt omnia in cœlestibus et terrâ, sive visibilia, sive invisibilia, sive sedes, sive Dominationes, sive principatus et potestates, omnia per ipsum et in ipso creata sunt. *Ambros. Comm. in Ps.* cxviii. *Serm.* 3. *c.* 1. Col. ii. 8. Videte, ne quis vos deprædetur per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam. *Cyprian. Ep.* lii. Cavete, ne quis vos deprædetur per philosophiam et inanem seductionem, secundum traditionem hominum, et secundum elementa hujus mundi. *Ambros. de fide L.* i. *c.* 3., *Comment. in Ps.* cxviii. *Serm.* 22. *c.* i. Videte, ne quis vos spoliet per philosophiam et inanem deceptionem, secundum traditionem hominum. *Hilar. L.* i. *de Trin. c.* 13. *et* xii. *c.* 20. Col. ii. 15. Exutus carnem et potestates ostentui fecit, triumphatis iis cum fiduciâ in semet ipso. *Hilar. de Trin. L.* i. *c.* 13. *et* ix. *c.* 10. Exuens se carnem principatus et potestates exemplavit, fiducialiter triumphans eos in semet ipso. *Contra Faust. L.* xvi. *c.* 29. 1 Pet. iii. 3. Ut sint non quæ à foris ornantur capillorum crispationibus, aut circumdatæ auro aut veste decorâ, sed ille absconditus cordis veri homo . . *Augustin. de bono conjug. c.* 12. Non in plicatû capillorum, aut auro aut veste pretiosâ, quoniam ille absconditus cordis homo, qui est pauper sæculo, ipse est locuples Deo. *Ambros. ad Virg. Exhort. Tom.* i. *p.* 141. *Ed. Erasm.*

Jerome speaks also of several interpreters, particularly in reference to the New Testament [d]. One

[d] Hieronym. ad Damas. Si autem veritas est quærenda de pluribus, cur non ad Græcam Originem revertentes, ea, quæ vel à *vitiosis interpretibus* malè reddita corrigimus? Neque vero ego de veteri disputo instrumento *de Novo nunc loquor Testamento*, quod Græcum non dubium est.

passage of Augustine seems no less to apply to the New than to the Old Testament, for he speaks of the multitude of those, who have translated the Bible from the Greek [e].

SECTION CXIII.

WHICH of these versions is of the earliest date, or when they begun to translate the New Testament into Latin, are questions not now easily to be answered to every one's satisfaction. Augustin says, PRIMIS FIDEI TEMPORIBUS [f], but this assertion may as well be understood of the commencement of the Ecclesiastical Communities, to which this Father immediately belonged, as to the origin of Christianity in general. We have not sufficient information concerning these first days of the faith in the PROVINCIA AFRICÆ, and with respect to the Bishops of Carthage themselves, we go no further back, than the end of the second century.

At this epoch, one or other of the African versions must have assuredly originated. For, Tertullian expresses himself by no means unintelligibly concerning the existence of one of this class. He speaks of a *callida aut simplex eversio*, which, in his opinion, incorrectly represents a passage of the New Testament. Instances of paronomasia, such as *eversio* for *mala versio*, are frequent in his works, and the following words "*in usum exiit*" prove likewise, that the multitude commonly used the Latin language in

[e] Augustin. de Doctr. Christ. L. ii. c. 11.

[f] L. ii. de doctr. Christ. c. 11. Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit Codex Græcus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguæ habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari.

guished preference [h]. Yet, natural as the circumstance is, some have nevertheless laboured, from what cause I know not, to expunge this *Itala* from his works.

Bentley was the first who proposed the conjecture, that probably *illa* should be read for *Itala*, and instead of NAM EST—*quæ est* verborum tenacior. Casley is said, afterwards to have remarked a variation of the MS. in this passage, but Ernesti so strongly favored and recommended this change, that it obtained among us many friends and defenders.

The variation in the MS., which David Casley remarked, only applies to the word *Itala*, yet is it no less important, whether the reading NAM EST be or not correct. If this remains, the proposed *illa* can in no wise harmonize with the context.

If then one MS. reads *illa* for *Itala*, or if two read it, what conclusion can be drawn? On what critical principle must we in this case proceed? Must we not inquire, which reading most readily arises out of the other? If this be so, must we not admit, that from the abbreviation of the word *Itala*, *illa* naturally sprung? But, we cannot so easily explain, how a Librarius could by any chance frame the word *Itala* out of *illa*. Or, were this explanation easy, whence is it, that from *illa*, which occurs so many thousand times in MSS., *Itala* is formed no where else? Of two readings, one of which presents a common expression of continual occurrence, the other one of more rare, to which according to the laws of criticism should the preference be given?

Among the proofs in behalf of *illa*, the context is

[h] L. ii. de Doctr. Christ. c. 16. In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala cæteris præferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.

particularly extolled, as favouring and requiring it. But, what says Augustin in the preceding chapter? If obscure and unintelligible phrases occur, it may be advantageous to their elucidation, to consult and compare several interpretations, yet revised copies alone must be procured, lest the examiner be deceived by their incorrectness. Then in the following chapter he adds: in ipsis autem interpretationibus cæteris præferatur—est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ. Et Latinis quibuslibet emendandis Græci adhibeantur, &c. As the words lie before us, there is no doubt that among the Latin interpretations, he would mention that which has the fewest unintelligible phrases, or that, which, *where* these occur in others, affords the greatest aid to their development. Now, if we assume, that it should have been read, *illa, quæ est*—what else would this Father say? but,—to elucidate obscure phrases, that version may be most advantageously used, which has the least obscurity. This is in fact a comfortless comfort, which even the most unlearned of his readers can give to himself, if necessary. Therefore he should have referred to a particular version, or designated one bearing that name, which in his opinion and in that of those acquainted with it, afforded aid in such a case. But, if the object of the writer, if the context requires some such a thing, we cannot hesitate in preferring that reading, which effects this, and names one of the versions, which exceeds the rest in perspicuity.

This is also the meaning of the Father, as he explains himself in another work. As to the question of the fidelity of the Latin versions, he says, *we must consult that, which originated in that country, from whence the instruction came to us,* and if this even produces not the desired object,

we must revert to the original language, from whence these versions were made[i]. He concedes here to a foreign version the superiority over the African, indeed he concedes it to the version of that country, whence the *Provincia Africæ* had its instruction. Whence then had these *Italian Colonies* along the African coast their instructions, but from the mother country?

It was therefore an Italic version, to which Augustin applies this encomium: but, which among the many which existed[k], he intended by it, it is indeed difficult now to discover, since Italy by degrees possessed several such, as we perceive from the quotations, which occur in the writings of the Fathers of this country. This Italic version, to which he alluded, he appears to have accounted even older, than those which were made in Africa.

[i] Augustin. L. xi. c. 2. Contra Faust. Manich. Ita si de fide exemplarium quæstio verteretur, sicut in nonnullis, quæ paucæ sunt, et sacrarum Litterarum notissimæ sententiarum varietates, vel *ex aliarum regionum Codicibus, unde ipsa doctrina commeavit*, nostra dubitatio dijudicaretur; vel si hi ipsi quoque Codices variarent, plures paucionibus, vetustiores recentioribus præferrentur; et si adhuc esset incerta varietas, præcedens lingua, unde illud interpretatum est, consuleretur.

[k] They have been collected by Petr. Sabatier: Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ Versiones Antiquæ, seu vetus Itala et cæteræ, quotquot in Codicibus MSS. et Antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt, quæ cum Vulgatâ Latinâ et cum textu Græco comparentur. iii. Vol. Remis. 1743. fol. And by Joseph Blanchini: Evangeliarium quadruplex Latinæ Versionis Antiquæ, seu veteris Italicæ, nunc primum in lucem editum, ex Codicibus MS^tis. aureis, argenteis, purpureis, &c. sub auspiciis Joannis V. Regis fidelissimi Lusitaniæ Algarbiorum, &c. Romæ 1749. Pt. ii. commonly in four Vols. fol.

SECTION CXV.

THE time in which these versions were made (the last half of the second, or the beginning of the third century), enables us easily to observe of what sort were the Greek copies, from which the authors laboured. It was that period, in which through the indiscreet studies of pious readers, the MSS. passed into that heterogeneous and arbitrary state, to which afterwards Origen, Hesychius, and Lucian placed a boundary: it was the period of the κοινη ἐκδοσις. We have already so expressly spoken of the text, which was the basis of these versions, that we can only here allow ourselves to recal those remarks to mind. § 27, 28.

SECTION CXVI.

THESE versions, as it was intended, passed into the hands of numberless readers. Each of them had their good and bad qualities: endeavours were hence made to remedy from the one that, which had not succeeded in the other; and thus, each of them obtained heterogeneous portions. Such conduct could not long continue, without so gradually admixing each version with the others, that it no longer resembled itself. And this really took place, for from the fourth century downwards each MS. seemed to be a separate version[1].

There were even eminent individuals, who im-

[1] Hieron. Ep. ad Damas. Si enim Latinis exemplaribus fides adhibenda est, respondeant quibus? tot enim sunt exemplaria, quot Codices.

puted a particular value to a copy; if it was interpolated from several versions: for they deemed, that by many representations of the same passage, the reader would be more easily able to understand and more rightly to interpret it [m]. So far would they have judged correctly, if other inconveniences had not over-weighed this advantage.

In addition to all this, we must reflect, that the readers did not allow it to be destitute of illustrative remarks and Scholia, which they wrote on it for their information; these afterwards not being always properly separated from the text, augmented the confusion.

They, who understood something of Greek, would avail themselves of it, by writing the Greek Testament by the side of the Latin versions, that they might easily consult the original text, when doubts arose, or when the translation seemed to be imperfectly expressed. From these Books arose the Græco-Latin MSS., of which we still have several. The possessors of these MSS., as we perceive from those still existing, often began arbitrarily to correct the translation from the Greek, according to their own views, and the more they corrected it, the more unlike was the translation to its original form.

No version, therefore, remained any longer exactly like itself; and since this was the case for a long period, so that the copies being without any public

[m] To explain obscure phrases, Augustine de doct. Chr. l. ii. c. 15. says, plurimum hic quoque juvat interpretum numerositas collatis codicibus inspecta atque discussa; tantum abait falsitas; nam codicibus emendandis primitùs debet invigilare solertia eorum, qui Scripturas divinas nôsse desiderant, ut emendatis non emendati cedant, ex uno duntaxat interpretationis genere venientes. Here, *non emendati* and *ex uno interpretationis genere venientes* are synonymous. The *Emendati*, therefore, are those, which have many additions from several versions.

superintendence, were resigned to the conceit of their possessors, the anxiety respecting the doctrines, which might be deduced from such singular books, was not without foundation.

THE EMENDATION OF JEROME.

SECTION CXVII.

To oppose this arbitrary procedure, and to meditate the introduction of order and harmony into these books, was a bold idea. Jerome was well aware of this, although he had been appointed to it by Damasus, the most illustrious Teacher in Christendom, who sat on the Roman chair. Quis enim (so he writes to him) doctus pariter vel indoctus, cum in manum volumen assumserit, et à salivâ, quam semel imbibit, viderit discrepare quod lectitat, non statim erumpat in vocem, me falsarium, me clamans esse sacrilegum, . . . adversum quam invidiam—me consolatur, quod et tu, qui summus sacerdos es, fieri jubes, &c.[a]

With these sentiments Jerome entered on his employment, and conducted himself in it with a moderation, which his wonted impetuosity caused none to expect. He compared one or more of the existing versions with Greek MSS., and framed them according to the original text, where it was necessary. But, that the difference between his emendation and the ancient versions might not be too striking, he was very careful in his selection of Greek MSS., and

[a] Epistola ad Damasum, or, as it is called in several books, Hieronymi in Evangelistas ad Damasum præfatio.

only used old copies, the text of which was analogous to those, from whence these versions had proceeded. He therefore only used copies of the period of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, and conscientiously guarded himself against the editions of Lucian and Hesychius, which too far receded from the text, to which the ears of the Latins were accustomed.

Besides going so cautiously to work in the choice of Greek MSS., he also made so discreet an use of them, that he only resorted to their assistance in those passages, where the sense was remarkably misconstrued, and a stronger line of conduct was necessary [p].

If we may argue from his commentaries to the critical rules, which he here in every case quietly followed, he occasionally consulted Origen's MSS. in suspicious passages [q]. Bentley applied this well-founded hypothesis to the singular idea of seeking without restrictions the recension of Origen in the emended editions of Jerome.

[o] Epist. ad Damas. Prætermitto eos codices, quos à Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio, quibus utique nec in toto veteri Instrumento post LXX Interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in *novo* profuit emendâsse. Igitur hæc præsens præfatiuncula pollicetur quatuor Evangelia Codicum Græcorum emendata collatione, *sed veterum, nec qui multum à Lectionis Latinæ consuetudine discreparent.*

[p] Epist. ad Dam. Ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum, quæ sensum videbantur mutare, correctis, reliqua manere pateremur.

[q] Comment. in Matt. xxiv. 36. In quibusdam codicibus additum est neque filius, cum in quibusdam Græcis et maxime Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus hoc non habeatur adscriptum. Comm. ad Galat. iii. 1. Quod in exemplaribus Adamantii non habetur, &c.

SECTION CXVIII.

With so much moderation did Jerome complete his laborious task! by which, as he had foreseen, he had raised up more opponents, than he had acquired friends. It was scarcely in circulation, ere the voice of the Jealous powerfully resounded against him, whom, nevertheless, he occasionally set right somewhat harshly[r]. When in one of the African churches, a trial of his corrected edition was made, such an uproar arose on account of one word, that the Bishop, unable otherwise to bring the people to his church, after considerable peril was forced to accede to an alteration of the passage[s].

Even the authority of Damasus availed so little to the general acceptation of his emendation, that each, as his judgment or prejudice guided him, received or rejected, at his own discretion, the Old or New Text.

In the fifth Century, even the chief Pontiff at Rome, Leo the Great, still made use of the old version, and even of one of those copies, which were not accounted the purest, as we conclude from the addition in Matt. xx. 28., vos autem quæritis de minimo crescere et de magno minui, &c., which he quotes in his letter to Pulcheria.

[r] Hieronym. Epist. xxvi. ad Marcellam. Ad me repente perlatum est, quosdam homunculos mihi studiosè detrahere, cur adversum auctoritatem veterum, et totius mundi opinionem, aliquid in Evangeliis emendare tentaverim. Quos ego cum possem meo jure contemnere (asino quippe lyra superfluè canit).... ita responsum habeant.... Latinorum codicum vitiositatem....ad Græcam originem....voluisse revocare, &c.

[s] Hieronym. Ep. cxii. ad Augustin. n. 21.

The authority of Gregory the Great in the sixth century, first determined the point in favour of Jerome's edition. He founded it on his moral expositions on Job, and only used the other version by way of collation, and rather for the sake of exposing its jejuneness, than of citing it in illustration. In the letter to Leander, Bishop of Seville, to whom he dedicated this work, he indeed says, that he used at one time the old, at another the new version, just as the one or the other happened to be better adapted to demonstration, since the Apostolical Chair, which he filled, recognized both [t]: but his conduct here evidently shews his predilection for Jerome. In his other writings he entirely abides by Jerome's edition, so that his citations would be of uncommon value in restoring this emendation.

In the seventh Century, it was also the prevailing and authorized emendation in Spain [u].

SECTION CXIX.

Whilst Jerome's emendation kept so closely by the side of the other versions, it might have frequently happened, that Jerome was elucidated from them, and even enriched by additions, which he himself had rejected. Yet, on the other hand, there were readers, who corrected the more ancient versions by consulting Jerome's edition, and thus formed a third

[t] Greg. Ep. ad Leandr. c. 5. Novam vero Translationem dissero; sed cum probationis causa exigit, nunc novam, nunc veterem per testimonia assumo; ut quia sedes Apostolica, cui Deo auctore præsideo, utrâque nititur, mei quoque labor studii ex utrâque fulciatur.

[u] Isidor. Hisp. de Offic. Eccles. l. i. c. 12.

text, which was a mixture of both. The silver MS. of the Gospels at Brescia is one of this sort, as it appeared to those, who have treated of the Codex itself[x]. Their opinion is substantiated by the following observations. The MS. on the whole, contains one of the more ancient versions, but it has not many of the additions and peculiarities, which occur in them. It adheres oftener than these to the expressions of Jerome. Blanchini[y] has made known another Codex of the Gospels VATIC. 7016., about the date of the eighth century, as the specimen of the writing shews, the text of which is partly composed of one of the old versions, partly of the edition of Jerome. This might more or less have so far been the case in many other MSS, that the complaints of the corruption of the MSS. occasioned, in the eighth century, a new revision of them.

THE EMENDATION BY ALCUINUS.

SECTION CXX.

THIS emendation is originally to be attributed to a Glorious Monarch, whose exalted spirit was ever active in good deeds, who first observed the occasion for it, and who, if indeed he required a person qualified to execute it, nevertheless pointed out to this individual the way, in which he should tread. The state of the Biblical MSS. did not es-

[x] Philip. Garbellus apud Blanchinium. Vindic. Canonicar. Scriptur. Vulgatæ Latinæ Editionis. Romæ, 1740. fol. p. ccclxxxvii. seq.

[y] Evangeliar. quadrupl. T. ii. p. Dciv. on the reverse, num. 34.

cape Charles the Great: he therefore ordered, that they should carefully provide, that good and pure copies of the Old and New Testaments should be had in the churches [a].

He afterwards caused Alcuinus to compile, in a selection, the Homilies of the Fathers for each Sunday and Festival, that the Clergy of his kingdom might have a Book of Sermons. To this he himself composed the preface, in which he speaks of *the emendations of the copies of the Bible*, as of a thing, which he had happily accomplished [a].

One would believe from his words, that he himself had been occupied in this emendation, which is not totally improbable. But the learned Monk Alcuinus particularly superintended it, as History and Himself in one of his works expressly declare [b].

The assertion of the Biographer of his Son, that Charles himself revised the four Gospels, has no relation whatever to the edition of Alcuinus, which had long been in the hands of the world. For he speaks of the pious occupations, in which the last

[a] Capitular. R. B. Franc. l. vi. c. 227. Volumus, et ita missis nostris mandare præcepimus, ut in Ecclesiis libri canonici veraces habeantur, sicut jam in alio capitulari sæpius mandavimus.

[a] This *homiliarium*, which Paul Warnefried afterwards improved, is often printed under the name of Alcuinus, *Spiræ*. 1482. Colon. 1530, 1539, 1557. fol. Igitur (Charles says in the preface) quia curæ nobis est, ut Ecclesiarum nostrarum ad meliora semper proficiat status ad pernoscenda sacrorum librorum studia nostro etiam, quo possumus, invitamus exemplo. Inter quæ jam pridem universos V. et N. Testamenti libros Librariorum imperitiâ depravatos, Deo in omnibus nos adjuvante, examussim correximus.

[b] Sigebert Gemblac. ad ann. 790. Of the sixth book of his Commentary on John, Alcuinus says, in his letter ad Gislam et Columbam: Totius forsan Evangelii expositionem direxissem vobis, nisi me occupâsset Domini regis Præceptum in Emendatione Veteris Novique Testamenti.

days of this Monarch's life were employed, such as almsgiving, reading, and correcting [c].

SECTION CXXI.

We are not here to look for a new version from the Greek: Charles desired not such, and Alcuinus promised none, but both speak of an Emendation of an existing Version. What that was, which he made the subject of his labours, we perceive in the introduction to Alcuinus's MSS. of the New Testament. He has placed before the Gospels Jerome's letter to Damasus, *Novum opus me facere cogis ex veteri*, and prefixed Jerome's Prologues to all the Books.

Blanchini [d] has given a copper-plate of the Exordium of Luke as far as ver. 16.,—of the second chapter from ver. 22. to the end, and the whole of the third from these MSS.—a specimen of the writing sufficiently large to represent, if necessary, the character of this emendation. These passages, collated with the quotations of Gregory the Great, give us the same result: we see from them, that it was the text of Jerome, to which Alcuinus devoted his labours.

[c] Theganus, ed. du Chesne. T. ii. Script. Francic. p. 277.

[d] Evangeliar. quad. P. ii. Tab. viii. Luke i. 1—16. is è Cod. Vallicellano B. n. 5. the second and third chapters are è Cod. Basilicæ S. Pauli extrà urbem, adorned with the portrait of Charles the Great. The writing is so alike in both, that they seem to have been written by one person.

SECTION CXXII.

THE more ancient MSS. of the edition of Alcuinus generally announce by one or more Epigrams, that they contain the recension of this scholar. Some, like the Amsterdam MS. thus exhibit their origin [e].

Quatuor hi rutilant uno de fonte fluentes,
Matthæi et Marci, Lucæ liber atque Johannis;
Sanctus Apostolus Lucas conscripserat Actus;
Bis septem docti per cartas dogmata Pauli,
Jacobi, Petri, Judæ et pia dicta Johannis,
Scribitur extremo Johannis in ordine tomus.
Jusserat hos omnes Christi deductus amore
Alchuinus Ecclesiæ famulus conscribere libros.

Others only contain the two last verses of this Postscript [f]. Others, such as the Codex Vallicellens. apud Blanchini, that of the Fathers of the Oratorium at Rome, one mentioned by Baronius in the year 778, which is in the Chiesa Nuova [g]—thus express themselves:

Codicis istius, quot sunt in corpore sancto
Depictæ formis litterulæ variis,
Mercedes habeat Christo donante per ævum
Tot Carolus rex, qui scribere jussit eum.
Pro me quisque legens versus orare memento:
Alchuinus dicor; tu sine fine vale.

[e] Wetstein Prolegom. in N. T.

[f] A Zürich Codex apud Biörnstähl in the fifth part of his Letters, p. 14.

[g] Blanchini Vindic. Canon. Script. pag. xxxvi. and pag. cccxxxv. Adler's Biblico-critical Tour, p. 162.

Some are more diffuse in epigrams of this sort; others however simply content themselves with the two last verses only.

SECTION CXXIII.

This edition was introduced by royal command into France, and from it those MSS. probably sprang, which in the following periods were in circulation on the other side of the Rhine, and on the German Bank of it, and still further in the direction of Pannonia. This is the text, which had been transplanted among us for nearly eight centuries, not without alterations, (as we may easily conceive) until the Council of Trent; which, by means of its decrees, proclaimed a new epoch, with regard to the Latin version.

Yet, during this period, they were not inactive in endeavours to maintain the Latin text in a durable state. Lanfrank, Bishop of Canterbury, in the 11th Century, not only revised the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, but also the works of the Fathers and the other Church-Books, and not satisfied with this, he employed his pupils on the same tasks. His Biographer concludes this account with the words: hujus emendationis claritate omnis Occidui Orbis Ecclesia tàm Gallicana quàm Anglica gaudet se esse illuminatam [b]. But this encomium does not merely apply to his Biblical, but to all his critical Labours on the Writings of the Fathers, Psalmody and the Liturgical Books, which is worthy of remark, lest from the words, *hujus emendationis claritate*, &c. it

[b] Vita Lanfranci in opp. Paris. 1648. fol. edit. Lucæ Dacherii. Wetstein. Prol. in N.T.

should be inferred, that he had accomplished a new Recension of the Old and New Testament, which became the authorized one in Gaul and England.

In the 12th and 13th Century there was a singular critical assiduity in preserving the text of the Latin Bible. Several communities began to compose *correctoria* for their own use; *i. e.* they revised some one MS. and marked on its margin, where other MSS. did not agree with it, and, in short remarks decided on the readings, which they rejected or adopted. In this decision they quoted the writings of the Fathers, also Illustrious Teachers after Charles the Great, Rhabanus, Haymo of Halberstadt and others, and often likewise the Greek Text. Nor did they stop here:—care was taken to restrain inconsiderate corrections: where the Latin did not entirely accord with Grammar, care was taken by means of remarks on these peculiarities of idiom, that no one should be induced to attempt anything in these passages. Some remarks related also to Interpunction, and even to Enunciation.

Something of this kind was projected by the Theological Faculty in the University of Paris, probably for the use of the Students, which was adopted and authorized by the Archbishop and Primate of Gaul, who had his seat at Sens. Richard Simon has described it [i].

The Dominicans did not coincide with the views of the Archbishop, and composed in the year 1236, by the command of their Provincial in Gaul, Hugo of St. Eher or Eherſs, one of their own [k]. Under

[i] Histoire crit. des versions du N. T. c. 9. et nouvelles Observations sur le texte et les versions du N. T. P. ii. ch. i.

[k] Martene Thesaur. Nov. Anecdot. T. iv. p. 1676. Statut. 34; Capit. Gen. Dominic.

Humbert de Romans, the fifth General of their Order, in a General Chapter at Paris, in the year 1256, the Correctorium of Sens was rejected without hesitation [l]. They adhered to their own on the authority of Charles's MSS., as Luke of Brugge, who frequently used this book, informs us from its preface [m].

The Carthusian Order also adopted in their Correctorium the edition of Alcuinus or Charles, as their standard [n].

Our Academical Library possesses a similar Correctorium. As we perceive from the first characters of the Prologue to the Old Testament, it was that of the Franciscan order:—the Pope is painted on its golden ground, in the act of handing a writing to some of this order: two of them receive it kneeling; four stand in the distance, as spectators.

I will extract but one specimen of each sort of remarks; the first relates to a various reading in Matt. xix. 20. Omnia hæc custodivi—on the margin is written—à juventute meâ—Græci habent. Sed Jeronimus Rhabanus et Antiqui non. The other refers to the Interpunction, Matt. xiv. 9. Et contristatus est Rex propter jusjurandum—on the

[l] Martene, loc. cit. p. 1715. Statut. 23. Capit. gener. Item correctiones Bibliæ Senonensis non adprobamus, nec volumus, quod fratres innitantur illi correctioni, &c.

[m] Lucæ Burgens. notationes in Sac. Biblia, 1584. apud Plantin. 4. Præf. p. 22. Exemplar....emendatum ante trecentos annos ex Caroli Magni Bibliis undequaque collectis, jussû, ut præfatio habet, F. Jordani Magistri ordinis Prædicatorum et F. Hugonis Prioris Provincialis in Franciâ à Prædicatoribus S. Dominici fratribus.

[n] Wilh. Lindanus de optim. Script. interpr. genere l. iii. c. 3. Tale quondam vidimus (Correctorium) pervetustum in Carthusiâ Zoelhemensi, juxta Diesthemium sita, quod Biblia ad Codices Caroli Magni perdiligenter castigatos notabat emendanda.

margin—sic distinguit Augustinus in omelia. The third concerns the language, Matt. xxi. 25. Baptismum Johannis unde erat?—on the margin—Antiqua Grammatica est. Hâc utitur Ambrosius in Sermon. Oct. in Ephes. et decimo octavo, &c. The remark on the order, which is found in 1 John v. 7. in some books is particularly interesting: Not.: quidam Libri habent hic alium ordinem, post testimonium Spiritûs, Aquæ, et Sanguinis, addunt: et hi tres unum sunt, et pergunt sic: et tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in Cœlo, &c.

This Correctorium occasionally cites, for the purpose of determining the text, those Fathers, who quote the text before Jerome, such as Augustin and Ambrosius. If this also was the case in others the Correctoria sometimes have contributed to disfigure Jerome's or Alcuinus's text by Parts introduced from other Sources.

Wilhelm Lindan speaks of a very early Correctorium from MSS. accounts, which Cardinal Bessarion obtained probably from the Vatican library, and which refer to the year 1144: sed præ cæteris equidem desiderarim illud, quod ante annos 400 Romæ Nicolaus S. Damasi Diaconus scripsit, maximâ, ut apparet, diligentiâ, ubi conqueritur, Lustrans armaria, inquiens, nequibam hoc adipisci, veracia scilicet exemplaria invenire, quia et quam à doctissimis viris dicebantur correcta, unoquoque in suo sensû abundante, adeô discrepabant, ut penè quot codices, tot exemplaria reperirem, usque adeò etiam millesimo ferè post interpretationem Hieronymi anno, codices mendosi atque corrupti erant, &c. *De optimo Scripturas interpretandi genere*, l. iii. c. 3. cf. l. i. c. 5.

It must not here be forgotten, that Nicolaus speaks of his own neighbourhood and of Rome, where

Charles's emendation was not permitted to be recognized. In France, where this was authorized, the text, notwithstanding the many alterations it had endured, was more uniform and similar in its various MSS.

SECTION CXXIV.

Since the MSS. then differed from each other in multiform variations, the printed editions in the 15th and 16th Centuries could not be well better, than the MSS. from which they were made. This variation became greater than ever in the 16th Century, more particularly at the time, when the Council of Trent was assembled: the editions of Robert Stephen, and those apud Colinæum, 1541, which bitterly complained in the preface of the errors of the Vulgate, directed the attention of many to them. The first occasion of this was the Hebrew and Greek text, which shortly before had been introduced to the eyes of the public, as well as the awakening study of Biblical criticism, which necessarily exposed the authorized Church version to many and unfavourable comparisons.

The Council of Trent readily perceived, that they must first be agreed respecting the Sources, whence the proofs were taken, before they could indulge any idea of unity respecting doctrine. It was, therefore, proposed to apply to this purpose a certain Hebrew and Greek copy, to be translated into Latin for the benefit of those, who were ignorant of the Languages [o]. But this was, as it were, to throw before the multitude a new matter for investigation, but they rather had reason

[o] Palavicini Hist. Conc. Trident. l. vi. c. 15.

to devise a pause to innovations, at least, for the sake of preserving those, who were devoted to the ancient Doctrine. Hence it was the most rational plan to protect the authorized version in the public estimation, as the Council actually did: Sess. iv. Decret. 2. Statuit et declarat hæc Sancta Synodus, ut hæc Vetus et Vulgata Editio, quæ longo tot Seculorum usû in Ecclesiâ ipsâ probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, aut expositionibus, pro authenticâ habeatur, ut eam nemo rejicere quôvis prætextû audeat vel præsumat.

They laboured much so to explain this decree, that it might not deprive the study of the original languages of its value. The meaning is this:—As in civil affairs an authentic instrument is that, which constitutes legal evidence, so in public religious proceedings the Vulgate is a Document, from which a sufficient evidence may be extracted, without, on the other hand, an exception existing against those, which have always been accounted documents. But, this is not a dogmatical rule, and from its nature cannot be such; it is a decree relative to discipline, which had for its object the circumstances of those times.

Among the many editions, of which none agreed with the other, they were first of all obliged to point out one, to which this privilege belonged, and in default of such, were forced to make up their minds to provide one. In the meanwhile, the Council only decreed this: ut posthàc Sacra Scriptura, potissimum vero hæc ipsa Vetus et Vulgata Editio, quam emendatissimè imprimatur.

SECTION CXXV.

The Theologians at Lyons, and among them Heutenius in particular now began to labour on a corrected edition, which appeared in the following year, 1547. But the Holy Chair at Rome had, as it appears, reserved this occupation for itself, wherefore Pius IV. and V. convoked Congregations, to whom it was entrusted. Sixtus V., whose impetuous activity could not brook so tedious a course of procedure, brought the work to an end [p], and announced its Completion by a Bull dated March 1st, 1589.

He caused a press of his own to be erected in the Vatican, and as the work was printed, *he himself corrected it*, as he says in his Bull. Novam interea Typographiam in Apostolico Vaticano Palatio nostro ad id potissimum magnificè exstruximus eaque res quo magis incorruptè perficeretur, *nostrâ nos ipsi manú correximus, si qua prælo vitia obrepserant*, &c. The title of the Book was dated one year later than this Bull, and is as follows; Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis, tribus Tomis distincta. Romæ, ex Typographiâ Apostolicâ Vaticanâ. M.D. XC. fol. After this comes a second Title, which is engraved, and represents the offering of Abraham, in the upper border of which is the Title. Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis ad Concilii Tridentini præscriptum emendata, et à Sixto V. P. M. recognita et approbata. Under it is a border with these words—accipe et devora.

The work being published in this state, especially under the circumstances of the time, gave to every

[p] Præf. in Ed. Clem. viii. in multis, &c.

one, who was fond of finding fault, matter for the purpose. Many passages, particularly in the Old Testament, were found covered over with small bits of paper, on which new corrections were printed; others were erased, or roughly altered with the pen. This must have appeared strange in a Book, which should be highly and præeminently regarded, both by members of the Roman faith, and by Protestants.

One English scholar not long afterwards collected these passages [q], and another increased their catalogue [r], and whoever will examine several copies, may easily add new contributions to them, since the variations have not been uniformly explored in all the copies.

In the Royal Library at Vienna two copies may be seen: the one on very great, the other on somewhat smaller paper. In one of them for example, in Gen. xli. 10., is the word *pecoribus* without any thing pasted over it: in the other it is covered with a small bit of paper, on which *prioribus* is read. But to speak of the New Testament—in Mark x. 1., there is in both copies a piece pasted on with the word *inde*. In Acts vii. 6. *et Isaac, et Jacob*, the last *et* is in the one Book destroyed by erasure, in the other the passage has received a yellow die. In Tit. ii 1. *Pudiei* is erased in the one book, in the other it has been changed with the pen into *pudici*. In Apocal. iii. 7. there is a piece pasted in the one with the word *Scribe:* in the other *Scribe* is rightly printed. In Apocal.

[q] Bullum Papale, sive concordia discors Sixti Quinti et Clementis Octavi circa Hieronymianam Editionem auctore Thomâ James, &c. Londini. 1600-4.

[r] Histoire de la Bible de Sixte Quint par Prosper Marchand, in Schelhorn Amænitates litterar. Tom. iv. p. 433. sq.

iii. 12. in the one *Scribæ* may be read, in the other there is a small bit of paper, and *Scribe* printed on it. All is nearly as Prosper Marchand found it in his copy.

Since it happened, that the Book met in this state the eyes of the public, which was disposed to form a strong judgment upon it, upon this let it rest. Thus much, however, we perceive, that this Prince, who was encompassed by many and great concerns, did more than could be exacted from him, and that he was worse served than he expected. Sixtus died in the August of the same year, and left to his successor the honor of replacing this work by a new one.

SECTION CXXVI.

Gregory XIV. again undertook the labour, and summoned for its execution a meeting of the Cardinals and Learned Men, among whom Bellarmin was particularly distinguished. Gregory did not see the work completed, but it appeared soon after the Commencement of the Office of his Successor, Clemens VIII.

But now the main difficulty was to produce the Edition in a perfect state of emendation. Should they degrade Sixtus's book and pronounce it faulty? By this neither the New Work nor the Papal Dignity could gain any thing in the public estimation. Should they then pronounce it good? Why then did they edite another? Bellarmin in this dilemma is said to have found a middle way, and to have proposed, that the whole blame should be laid upon the Printer, for the sake of rescuing Sixtus and the honor of his Successor.

Thus stands he excused in the preface of this second edition: Quod cum jam esset excusum, et ut in lucem emitteretur, idem Pontifex (Sixtus) operam daret, animadvertens non pauca in sacra Biblia prælo vitio irrepsisse, quæ iteratâ diligentiâ indigere viderentur, totum opus sub incudem revocandum censuit atque decrevit. Id verò cum morte præventus præstare non potuisset, Gregorius XVI., &c. Bellarmin is the author of this preface [a], which is said to have caused him to be canonized [b]. Doubtless the greatest part of the corrigenda in Sixtus's Bible is to be imputed to the fault of the printer, yet from the learning and impetuous self-confidence of Sixtus it was to be expected, that here and there he would offend the judgement of censors, and in opposition to their opinion make emendations with his own hand. But as the case stands, so far it is evident, that in the second edition they had not devised the plan of purifying Sixtus's text, or that they had failed in the attempt. Yet the latter differs from the former by several hundreds of variations.

The second edition, which became the model of the present text of the Vulgate, appeared, like the first, with two titles, of which one was printed and

[a] Vita del Cardinale Roberto Bellarmino, composta dal P. Giacomo Fuligatti in Roma. 1624. 4. capit, 13.

[b] Le Bret, Dissertatio Theol. de usû Versionis Lat. Vet. in Ecclesiâ Christ. Tubing. 1786. § 23. p. 54. This is perfectly correct, as this essay shows: Voti degl. infrascritti eminentissimi Signori Cardinali, B. Gregorio Barbarigo, Gieronimo Casanate, Dacio Azzolini, Domenico Passionei, nella causa della Beatificatione de venerabile Servo di Dio Card. Roberto Bellarmino, seconda Editione, in Ferara 1762. si vende in Venezia al insegne di Demosthene. Le Bret says an earlier edition of it (Venice 1761.) The *Votum* of Cardinal Passionei is found in MS. in the Bibliotheca Angelica, to which the Cardinal gave his valuable collection of books.

the other engraved. The printed one is—Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis, Romæ ex Typographiâ Apostolicâ Vaticanâ M.D.XCII. The engraved page is like that of Sixtus, and its inscription is—Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis Sixti Quinti Pont. Max. jussû recognita atque edita. Below is—accipe et devora. The Præfatio ad Lectorem begins—In multis magnisque beneficiis, &c. This is followed by the Decretum Concilii Tridentini and the Bull:—Clemens P. Octavus ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Cum Sacrorum Bibliorum Vulgatæ Editionis textus, &c.—dat. Romæ apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die 9 Novembris 1592.

In the following year 1593 a quarto edition of it was prepared at the Vatican press. Both are rare: but that of Sixtus is reckoned among the early typographical rarities, either because only few copies of it were published, or because they were gradually[a] collected back again, or from both causes together.

SECTION CXXVII.

The preface of Bellarmin is in a great degree occupied in detailing to us the plan of the Censors, and in informing us the rules, which they had prescribed to themselves. Yet he has not always taken care to give an intelligible and accurate statement of them.

We might believe, that they proposed to restore the Vulgate to its original state: ipsam veterem et vulgatam Editionem Latinam à mendis veterum Libra-

[a] Le Bret, Dissert. de usû versionis Lat. Veteris in Eccl. § 23. p. 53.

riorum, necnon pravarum emendationum erroribus repurgatam, suæ pristinæ integritati ac puritati, quoad ejus fieri potuit, restituere. What Jerome, from whom the expression is borrowed, calls *communem et vulgatam*, was that text, which was common before his time.

In another place Bellarmin seems to declare himself in favour of Jerome's recension, as that which was intended to be revised and introduced to public use. Quare non immeritò Catholica Ecclesia S. Hieronymum Doctorem maximum atque ad Scripturas Sacras interpretandas divinitus excitatum ita celebrat, ut jam difficile non sit illorum omnium damnare judicium, qui vel tàm eximii Doctoris lucubrationibus non acquiescunt, vel etiam meliora, aut certè paria se præstare confidunt. Cæterùm ne tam fidelis translatio, &c.

This occurred, when the censors quoted Rhabanus, Haymo, Anselm, Peter Damiani and the other Teachers, whom they enumerate, to correct the text. They follow in their works Charles's MSS., which exhibit Jerome's text as corrected by Alcuinus.

Yet they proceeded with very great forbearance, designedly overlooking some points, which seemed to require a stronger correction. In hâc tamen pervulgatâ lectione sicut nonnulla consultò mutata, ita etiam alia, quæ mutanda videbantur, consultò immutata relicta sunt.

THE GOTHIC VERSION.

SECTION CXXVIII.

Long before the war of Thirty years broke out, a MS. of the Four Gospels was preserved in the Abbey of Werden, in Westphalia, in an old German dialect, written with silver characters [y]. Being desirous of withdrawing this document from the dangers which impended over it, it was deposited with other valuables at Prague: but even here, some few months before the peace, it fell into the hands of the Swedes, as under General Kœnigsmark in the year 1648 they unexpectedly scaled the weak side [z].

It was then deposited in the Royal Library at Stockholm, and said to have been given as a present to the celebrated Isaac Voss, by Queen Chris-

[y] We have the history of this book in Ihre's Dissert. i. de Cod. Argent. § 14, 15. and in Zahn's historico-critical Introduction to Ulfilas's Translation of the Bible, § 39—46.

[z] According to the accounts of the Swedes, which I prefer to other reports and hypotheses. (Ihre, Diss. i. loc. cit.) Ihre accounts Voss's accusation respecting the illegal seizure of it not proved, although he must have known, what Nettelblatt had 86 years before published on the subject. How could also Junius say in the letter au de la Gardie, which he prefixed to his Ulfilas, if his nephew had stolen the book? Habeo, sane, quod cœlo imputem; siquidem intelligo Immortalis Dei nutù memoratum Codicem ad manus meas perlatum. Or how could Ulitius say in the carmen au de la Gardie, which stands before Junius's Glossar. Gothic., if Voss had been a thief?

Si Vossî memor est, et honorat Suedia nomen,
(Lucidius docto non micat orbe jubar)
Tantus hic et tanti nec avunculus esse nepotis
Ignotus vestris, neve latere, potest.
Ille Palatinis pluteis, quæ promserat ante,
Hîc tibi nunc cultù splendidiore refert.

tina, whose particular favour he enjoyed. Others, however, reverse it, saying, that he himself presented it to her.

During the Westphalian negotiations for peace, Count Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie came to the knowledge of this precious monument; he obtained it from Voss for 400 rixdollars, and delivered it to the custody of the University of Upsal, where it is still found.

With this MS. the Count also deposited a very correct transcript of it, in which from letter to letter, and from line to line in an equal number of pages, the original writing was carefully copied. One Derrer (no one knows when and where) undertook this laborious task. The famous Civilian of this name, who in the first half of the sixteenth century adorned our schools, is not the person, as I am convinced by my investigations. This transcript perished in the great fire at Upsal in the year 1702.

SECTION CXXIX.

JUNIUS obtained the use of the Codex from his nephew, and edited it in Gothic characters cast by himself for the purpose. Whether Junius found Derrer's transcript, or had caused it to be made, is uncertain; yet, that he carefully consulted the Codex itself, Thomas Marshall says, who lived and laboured with him, as the work was passing through the press [a]. Junius himself speaks also with regret of his endeavours to retrace and comprehend the characters which had vanished [b].

[a] After the remarks on Mark, p. 442.

[b] In the preface to the annexed Glossarium Gothicum.

We possess a second edition by Stiernhelm after Derrer's transcript, with Latin characters, of the year 1671, in which he occasionally referred to the Codex itself[c]. In the year 1684 an impression of Junius's edition appeared with the same types, the same title, and in the same form, at Amsterdam; probably it had only a new title page, for the purpose of selling the remainder of the first edition under another name. Archbishop Benzel afterwards conceived a liking for the ancient document, devoted his labour to it, and made preparations for a new edition; but he did not live to see the fruit of his pains, which Edward Lye indifferently edited as to judgment and fidelity. It even seems, that the Archbishop purposed to have caused the whole Codex to be *copied* in woodcuts, of which I possess a very successful specimen[d]. In the meantime Ihre, who lived in the neighbourhood of this precious document, undertook to execute it, but since his eyes were unequal to the employment, he appointed a young man, named Ehrich Sotberg, to compare again the editions of Junius and Benzel with the original document, and the emendations thus obtained he published in a treatise entitled Ulfilas illustratus[e]:—for his own use also, he caused a very correct transcript of the Codex to be made.

Not succeeding in making a new edition, he sent

[c] Ihre—diss. i. de Cod. Argent. § 15.

[d] Ulfiliani Codicis sculpturâ ligneâ edendi specimen Benzelianum. Lincopiæ excusum curâ Frid. Arendt. MDCCCV. Cal. Jan.

[e] These and several treatises of Ihre, which relate to the Codex, to its Grammar, idioms, &c. together with some other treatises on the subject, Büsching the Geographer has published, in a well-arranged collection: Johannis ab Ihre scripta versionem Ulphilanam, et linguam Mœso-Gothicam illustrantia.... unà cum aliis scriptis similis argumenti edita ab Ant. Fr. Büsching. Berolini. 1773. 4.

this transcript to Büsching, to prepare one according to it. From Büsching the transcript past to Heynatz. Heynatz lent it to the Priest Zahn, who finally succeeded in bringing to light his Ulfilas from it[f]. The text is carefully given; the gramma-

[f] All the hitherto enumerated editions only acknowledge one Source. As each of the editors shews on the title-page what he has done, and added for the elucidation and better understanding of the Document, we here quote the editions with the entire titles.

1. Quatuor D. N. Jesu Christi Evangeliorum versiones perantiquæ duæ, Gothica scilicet et Anglo-Saxonica, quarum illam ex celeberrimo Codice argenteo nunc primum deprompsit Franc. Junius, T. F. hanc ex codicibus MSS. collatis emendatiùs recudi curavit Thomas Mareshallus, Anglus: cujus etiam observationes in utramque versionem subnectuntur. Accessit et Glossarium Gothicum, cui præmittitur Alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum, &c. operâ ejusdem Franc. Junii. Dord. 1665. in 4^to^.

2. D. N. Jesu Chr. SS. Evangelia ab Ulfilâ Gothorum in Mœsiâ Episcopo, circa annum à nato Christo CCCLX. ex Græco Gothicè translata, nunc cum parallelis versionibus, Sueo-Gothicâ, Norræanâ seu Islandicâ, et vulgatâ Latinâ edita. Accedit Fr. Junii Glossarium Gothicum, linguâ Sueo-Gothicâ modernâ et antiquâ locupletatum et illustratum, curâ et studio Georgii Stirnhielmii. Stockholm, 1671. 4.

3. Amstelodami. 1648. This has the same title as the first.

4. Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Gothica, ex codice argenteo emendata atque suppleta cum interpretatione Latinâ et annotationibus Erici Benzelii non ita pridem Archiep. Upsaliensis edidit, observationes suas adjecit, et Grammaticam Gothicam præmisit Edwardus Lye, A. M. Oxonii è typographeo Clarendoniano MDCCL—4. It is well printed with the characters of the Codex Argenteus, and rare.

5. Ulfilas Gothische Bibelübersetzung, die älteste Germanische Urkunde, nach Ihrens text, mit einer Grammatisch-wörtlichen Lateinischen Uebersetzung, zwischen den Zeilen, sammt einer Sprachlehre und einem Glossar, ausgearbeitet von Friederich Karl Fulda, weiland Pfarrer in Ensingen im Würtembergischen; das Glossar umgearbeitet von W. F. H. Reinwald Herzogl. Sachs. Rath und Oberbibliothekar in Meinigen, und den Text nach Ihrens genauer Abschrift der silbernen Handschrift in Upsal, sorgfältig berichtigt, die Uebersetzung und Sprachlehre verbessert und ergänzt, auch mit Ihrens Lateinischer Uebersetzung neben dem texte, und

tical and critical remarks added in the margin below, are short, directly applied to the point, and well conceived, and the whole of the rich apparatus of the Book is valuable.

SECTION CXXX.

The original is called Codex Argenteus from its characters, which are placed in beautiful, great, and regular Uncial letters, with silver on a very fine purple coloured parchment, in great quarto. The initial lines of the Gospels, and the first line of each division are of gold. Below, the Canons of Eusebius are inserted between columns, which are drawn according to no order known, in barbarous taste, and on the side the numbers are added which refer to them. The Gospels follow this order—Matthew—John—Luke—Mark.

The characters themselves appear neither to have been written with the pen nor the reed, but probably to have been impressed with moulds cut or cast for the purpose, in the same manner as Bookbinders overlay titles at the backs of books with gold or silver. The perfect uniformity of the characters, the deep impressions which they make in the page, the traces of the binding materials occasionally discernible between the silver and the parchment :—the whole of which Ihre has proved by evidence, and of which he gives an account in the preface to the Ulphilas Illustratus,

mit einer vollständigen Kritik und Erläuterung in Anmerkungen unter demselben, sammt einer historisch-kritischen Einleitung versehen und herausgegeben von Johann Christian Zahn, Prediger in Delitz an der Saale bey Weissenfels in Sachsen. Auf Kosten des Herausgebers. Weissenfels. 1805. 4.

render this credible, whatever hasty travellers and superficial observers may say to the contrary.

Some indeed are inclined to impute these appearances to the ink, against which I must remark, that not long ago I saw purple books written with silver at Brescia and Verona, and very beautiful fragments of the Gospel of Matthew in the Vatican, but I no where observed indentures or remains of a binding-material.

The pages of this MS. do not follow one another in their order, and several are totally wanting. Matthew commences at v. 15. and at vi. 32, a chasm begins as far as vii. 12. There is a second from x. 1—23. From xi. 25, all is wanting as far as xxvi. 70. The whole of the last chapter is also wanting. In Mark are lost from vi. 31—54., from xii. 38—xiii. 18., from xiii. 29—xiv. 5., from xiv. 16—41., from xvi. 12. to the end. In Luke from x. 30—xiv. 9., from xvi. 24—xvii. 3., from xx. 37. to the end. John begins with v. 45. and wants xi. 47—xii. 1., and from xii. 49—xiii. 11., and from xix. 13, to the end. Besides which, single verses have here and there received injuries, which we would not here enumerate.

SECTION CXXXI.

Some years after the edition of the Gospels, which Lye edited, the Consistorial-Councillor Knittel remarked in a MS. belonging to the Library of Wolfenbüttel, which probably was written in Spain in the 9th century, and contained the well-known Origines of Isidore of Seville, that under some of the pages of this book an older writing lay concealed, which was washed away, that Isidore's work might be written upon it. He succeeded with much trouble in

retracing the more ancient letters. Fortunately, they were fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, in the same language and character as those, in which the Codex at Upsal was written, with the ancient Latin version antecedent to Jerome by the side. The fragments discovered are the following: Rom. xi. 33, 34, 35, 36., and xii. 1—5., then 17—21., xiii. 1—5., xiv. 9—20., and the last xv. 3—13, in brackets. He published them in the year 1762 with remarks and expositions [s].

The little now possessed of the Epistles of Paul was prized, but it was a gift of good fortune, and hardly promised future ages to expect a considerable increase, yet in the year 1817 Angelo Mai gave an account of important parts of the Gothic version, which he had discovered in the Ambrosian library.

Under the homilies of Gregory the Great on Ezekiel, written in the 8th century, he had remarked older characters like those of the Codex Argenteus, which had been washed out. More accurate research led him to the happy conclusion, that he had discovered in the Gothic language important fragments of all Paul's Epistles, with the exception of the two to the Thessalonians and that to the Hebrews. A second MS., somewhere about the 9th century, which contained Jerome's expositions on Isaiah, likewise

[s] Ulphilæ Versionem Gothicam nonnullorum capitum epistolæ Pauli ad Romanos è liturâ MS. rescripti Bibliothecæ Guelpherbytanæ cum variis monumentis ineditis eruit, commentatus est, deditque foras Franc. Ant. Knittel. Brunovici. 1762. 4. Ihre edited it again with new remarks under the following title: Fragmenta versionis Ulphilanæ, continentia particulas aliquot Epistolæ Pauli ad Romanos, haud pridem ex codice rescripto Biblioth. Guelferb. eruta, et à Fr. Ant. Knittel Archidiac. edita, nunc cum aliquot annotationibus typis reddita à Johanne Ihre, &c. Upsaliæ. 1763. 4. This last is reprinted in Büsching's Collection, p. 97. Zahn has also added it to his Ulfilas.

concealed the Gothic text of the Epistles of Paul, with the exception of those to the Romans and Hebrews. The Epistles of Paul here lying concealed under Jerome, do not merely constitute a supplementary part to the preceding, but were originally an independent Codex.

Behind a Latin MS. of the four Gospels, a page was bound from an older Codex. On this page also, containing a fragment of the Latin version of Matthew, Mai perceived expunged Gothic characters. It contained two fragments of Matthew, viz. xxv. 38, —xxvi. 3. and xxvi. 65.,—xxvii., of which the first, and the six first verses of the second (xxvi. 65—71.) restore an hiatus in the Codex Argenteus.

In the first mentioned MS. of the Homilies of Gregory, on Paul's Epistles, a fragment of an expunged Gothic calendar is also found. In other MSS. some fragments of the Old Testament and a Gothic Homily, rich in Biblical quotations, are discovered, from whence individual verses, obliterated in the Codex Argenteus, are obtained to repair the loss.

Count Charles Octavius Castilioni took the most lively interest in the discovery; he assisted Angelo Mai with his knowledge of the German dialects, and in the preparations which the edition required. Both jointly wrote a detailed account of the discoveries, described the MSS. in which these literary treasures had lain concealed, and produced, as a specimen, some passages of the Gothic documents, which they had found[b]. As Mai was appointed to the Vatican Library, and there attended to his appointment, the whole weight of the task fell on Count Castilioni,

[b] Ulphilæ partium ineditarum in Ambrosianis Palimpsestis ab Angelo Maio repertarum specimen conjunctis curis quidem Maii et Caroli Octavi Castilianæi editum. Mediolani, Regiis typis MDCCCXIX. 4.

from whence it happens, that the edition has been longer delayed, than both scholars expected, or we desire.

SECTION CXXXII.

The language of these documents is a dialect of an ancient people, who once dwelt much to the North, and were accustomed to reckon the years by winters. Twelve years are in Matt. ix. 20, and Luke ii. 42. ΤΨΛΛΙΒ ΨΙΝΤΚΠΝS, as well as in Luke viii. 42. They had no word for lilies, but resorted to the common expression ΒΛϘΜΛΝS, (*Blumen*) Matt. vii. 28.

Afterwards, this people came in contact with the Greeks, so that certain words and expressions became current and known to them, whence the Translator of the Gospels was able to retain them without trouble, even where in his own language he had terms to express them. His nation had certainly the word *Lohn:* it occurs in Luke vi. 32., and also elsewhere: ΘΛ ΪΖΨΙS ΛΛΠΝΕ ΪST. Nevertheless, where μισθος occurs in the Greek text, he almost always adheres as to a well-known term to ΜΙΖΔϘ. Matt. v. 56.; vi. 3.; Luke vi. 23, &c. They did not want a word to designate a basket: it occurs in Mark viii. 19; John vi. 13. ΤΛΙΝϘϘΝS, or *Zainen* in our language; nevertheless, the translator occasionally adopted the Greek σπυριδας; SΠΨΚΕΙΔΛΝS, Mark viii. 8. 20. For a royal mandate they had a technical term ΓΛΓΚΕϞΤS Luke ii. 1. derived from the Greek γραφω. They had expressions for the noon and evening meals, Luke xiv. 12.; Mark vi. 21. yet this does not prevent him from choosing the Greek δοχη for a banquet, Luke v. 29. δοχην μεγαλην—ΔΛΠhΤ ΜΙΚΙΔΛ. Probably it happened only in Luke i. 10. from want

of a suitable word, that he could not avoid the Greek θυμιαμα ΨΥMIΛMIN.

But they came still more in contact with those nations, which spoke the Roman language, as the many Latin words prove, which were apparently quite familiar to the readers of this version. To seat oneself at table they call ΛNΛKnMЬϚΛN, Mark ii. 15. vi. 22., Luke v. 29. and in vii. 49. also MIΨΛNΛKnMЬϚΛN; drinking vessels are ΛnK-KϚЄ, *urcei*, Mark vii. 5.; vinegar is ΛKЄITIS, Matt. xxvii. 48., Mark xv. 36.; a purse is ΛKKΛ, John xiii. 29; Money is called ΛIZ, *æs*, Mark vi. 8.; cereous envelops are ÞΛSKϚЄ, Joh. xi. 44.; soldiers MIΛITϚNΔΛNS. Luke iii. 14., where also the word ΛNNϚM occurs for *annona*; a prison they call KΛK-KΛKΛ, Matt. v. 25., xi. 2.; Mark vi. 17. Some expressions are common both to Greeks and Romans, as ΛKϚMΛTΛ, Mark xvi. 1.; ΠΛKΛKΛЄTnS[1], Joh. xiv. 25.

The Translator would have avoided several of these words, and rendered them by his own native terms, unless he were convinced that his countrymen well understood all of them. They, indeed, also sat or reclined at meals; they also had water-vessels; they had their own word for money, which is of frequent

[1] It is absurd to quote these words as bearing a relation to the Greek and Latin languages, because it is obvious to the most superficial observer, that this relation pervades the whole of the Gothic to a considerable extent, as we might naturally expect from the History of those who spoke it; for instance, if we examine the prepositions alone, we shall find ÏN—ἐν—*in*—nÞ—ὑπο—*sub*—nΠΛK ὑπερ—*super*—ΛЬn—ἀπο—*ab*—ΛNΛ—ἀνα—MIΨ—μετα—nNΛ—ἀντι—nS—ἐκ. Nor could it well be otherwise, if we consider the common origin, and undeniable affinity of these three languages, the Zend, the Sanscrit, and the Pali, to which alone the analogy, which many have observed between particular branches of them, must be retraced.—TRANSLATOR.

occurrence; they also had a word to designate a warrior: nothing, therefore, could induce him to have recourse to Latin words, but the *usus loquendi* of his nation, and the consciousness, that these words were of common occurrence among them, and intelligible to them.

Thus much of the history of the people lies in their language. If we now examine the German tribes, we find none which was in such an intercourse with the Greeks and Latins, as for it to have had so great an influence on their language, as the Goths. After Constantine, they were in very near connexion with the Oriental Empire; they afterwards occupied the Roman provinces along the Danube, from whence they proceeded to establish two new Kingdoms in the District of this State.

SECTION CXXXIII.

It seems that the Learned paid no regard to observations of this sort, since they broached the hypothesis, that this version might probably be Franconian.

Yet the Franconians, until Ottfried of Weissenburg, had no version of the Bible in their language. In construction, the Franconian is strikingly different from the Language of the Codex Argenteus, particularly in the union of the verbs *to be* and *to have*, as auxiliaries in the formation of certain tenses: in the formation of the passive voice, and in the use of the dual number, which the Franconian has not. When this introduction first appeared, it was necessary to treat all this with precision, and to pass much more under observation, to find out the German tribe, to which both the documents at Upsal and Wolfenbüttel could have belonged. But we are now

arrived at such circumstantiality, that, if we may so speak, we have seal and document for it: at least, we certainly have the last.

The letter of purchase, which was preserved in the episcopal Archives at Arezzo, and has a subscription in five lines with characters like the Codex Argenteus, has been indeed longer known. Doni was the first, who brought to light the Document at Arezzo [k]; but he did not closely adhere to the characters, but fashioned them after the form of the printed letters: Lye, Knittel, Ihre, who trusted to him, repeated his errors. Abate Marini, an illustrious scholar, again obtained a sight of the Document, and edited it with the accuracy of an antiquary [l]. We see from the drawing, that the strokes are indeed the same, as in the Codex Argenteus, yet not beautifully written, but merely from the hand of an unpractised writer. This Document gives no explanation to whom the written characters belong, since it contains neither trace nor indication of what nation they were who framed it.

On this account the valuable memorial at Naples is more decisive: it was formerly among the Archives della SS. Annunciata, and now is in the Royal Library at Naples, in the Saloon of MSS., where it is suspended within glass in a frame on the window fronting the main-street. Sabbatini [m] edited it first, Ihre, [n] and after

Donii Inscriptiones Antiquæ, ed. ab Ant. F. Gorio. Florentiæ, 1731, p. 469.

[l] I Papyri Diplomatici raccolti ed illustrati d'all'Abate Gaetano Marini, primo custode della Bib. Vatic. e Prefeto degli Archivi Secreti della Santa Sede in Romæ MDCCCV, nella Stamparia della S. Congreg. de prop. fide. N. cxviii. p. 179. 8vo.

[m] Il vetusto Calendario Neapolitano scoverto, con varie note illustrato dal Ludovico Sabbatini d'Anfora. Neap. 1744, 4. p. 101—106.

[n] Monument. vet. linguæ Ostrogothicæ, Neapoli repertum, illustratum à Jo. Ihre in novis Actis Societat. Scient. Upsaliensis, vol. iii. Ups. 1780. p. 1—31.

him Zahn[a], attempted to illustrate it. But this Document was not correctly and accurately copied: Marini[b] first obtained the credit of giving a correct fac-simile of it. At length, Count Sierakowski caused another copy to be taken, and engraved from the original; of which, however, no impression was to be found in the Italian shops for curiosities and books.

This Document is a deed of sale, on Egyptian papyrus, about the year 551, which all the clergy of the Gothic church of St. Anastasia (*aclisie Gotice sancte Anastasie*) subscribed. Of the subscription, which contains 66 lines, 16 lines are written with characters, which hitherto we could only conjecturally call Gothic. We here see now to which nation the characters belonged; though they are any *thing* but from the hand of a calligraphist; nevertheless the strokes of the Codex at Upsal are no more easy to be mistaken therein than the language.

Among the confirmatory Documents, we must reckon the fragments of a calendar discovered by Mai, written in the same characters as the Epistles of Paul, which he found. The pages contain the last eight days of June, and the whole of July. Two festivals shew the nationality of this fragment of an Ecclesiastical Book: the one on the 23rd June, "THAT OF THE MARTYRS PUT TO DEATH AMONG THE GOTHS, AND OF FRITHARIK;" the other on the 29th of the same month, "IN MEMORY OF THE MARTYRS, WHO WERE BURNT WITH BEREKA THE PRIEST AND BATWIN THE MINISTER OF THE GENERAL CHURCH OF THE GOTHS[c]."

[a] An attempt at elucidating the remains of the Gothic language in Naples and Arezzo, as a supplementary essay and addition to Ulfilas, by J. Chr. Zahn, Brunswick, 1804—8.

[b] I Papiri Diplomatici raccolti, &c. N. cxix. p. 180, 81, 82.

[c] Ulphilæ partium ineditarum specimen, p. 26, 27.

In other points, the calendar only renders that probable, which the Document at Naples exalts to a certainty.

SECTION CXXXIV.

Except the silver codex at Upsal, and the leaves which Knittel discovered at Wolfenbüttel, all the other Documents relating to this subject are found in Italy. Probably even the silver codex was made in Italy. For the MSS. which are written on purple parchment with silver characters, and the initiatory lines with gold, belong to that country.

The Augustins of St. John de Carbonara at Naples formerly possessed the splendid MS. on purple, with silver and gold, containing the Gospels of Luke and Mark, which now is in the Royal Library of Vienna. The Books of the four Gospels at Brescia, Codex Brixiensis Argenteus, and at Verona, Codex Argenteus Veronensis, described by Bianchini, are known: in both places they are preserved in the library of the Cathedral. In the Cathedral library at Peruggia, there are fragments of the Gospel of Luke, on purple, with silver. *Bianchini Evangeliarium quadruplex*, T. ii. p. DLXI.

The silver Codex of Upsal thus arranges the Gospels: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. They are in this order in the MSS. at Brescia and Verona, in the Codex of St. Eusebius at Vercelli, and as far as it relates to Luke and Mark, in the before-named MS. at Vienna.

Below the Gospels of the Upsal Codex stand the canons of Eusebius: the space in which the sections of the four Evangelists are divided with the Ammo

nian or Eusebian numbers, is separated into seven compartments by means of columns. The columns are united above by an arch or vault, in the style of an architectural drawing: the capitals of the columns are executed according to none of the usual orders, but in barbaric taste, which we call Gothic. Now precisely the same drawing and decoration of the capitals of the columns may be seen below on the Latin Gospels in the Codex Argenteus Brixiensis[r]. Such contingencies which, bound by no law, were adopted according to the custom of a district or country, are well calculated to point out a peculiar territory.

If, as the preceding reasons render it very probable, the Upsal Codex was written in Italy, its date falls at the latest in the beginning of the sixth century, before the Gothic Dominion ended in Italy, and the whole nation was nearly extirpated there.

The remains of the Epistle to the Romans alone at Wolfenbüttel seem to be indebted to Spain for their origin. When they were expunged, the *Origines* of Isidore of Seville were written over them in Latin characters, as we find, according to Knittel's assertion, in the Spanish Documents of the tenth Century.

SECTION CXXXV.

We may now devote our attention to the Gothic nation, since we are certain, that we possess the greatest part of the New Testament in their language. When they first attracted the particular notice of history, they dwelt on the eastern bank of

[r] Cf. the drawing in Büsching's Analectis Ulphilianis, Diss. i. de Cod. Argent. p. 189. with Bianchini's, Vindiciæ Canonic. Script. Vulgatæ E[illegible], &c. Romæ. 1740. fol. p. ccclxxxi.

the Dniester, and along the coast of the Black Sea, in regions, whose boundaries are unascertained towards the north and north-east. Another party of them had established themselves between the Dniester and Pruth, as far as the mouths of the Danube: these are called Western Goths, and the former Eastern Goths. From thence, after the time of Caracalla, they disturbed the Roman Provinces, or served the Cæsars for pay against other nations; more frequently it was agreed, for the sake of keeping them quiet, to pay them a yearly sum of money, under the plea of alliance. If the promised sums were denied to them, an irruption into the Roman territories was certain; sometimes even, when they had been paid to them, they nevertheless came from love of rapine, as soon as they perceived their advantage in it.

In the time of the indolent Galienus, not only the Goths, but the wild tribes on every side made these visits. To these irruptions, during the reign of Galienus, the Christian Historical Books ascribe the conversion of the Barbarians, and of the Goths in particular. Among the hosts of captives, whom they took away with them, there were also Priests, by whom they were instructed in the doctrines of Christianity. In their progress, they extended themselves as far as Pontus, as we perceive from the Ecclesiastical Enactments, which Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, called Thaumaturgus, found against wicked Christians, who purchased the spoil of the land from the Βορανδοι and Γοτθοι, betraying also treasures or helping to remove them[t].

[t] Sozom. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 6. more copiously, in Philostorg. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 5.

[t] Beveregii Synodicon, sive Pandectæ Canon. T. ii. Oxon. 1672.

Several Historians speak of their march or marches to Pontus. The Goths, says Eutropius, ravaged Pontus and Asia [u]. Another says, the Scythians, or a party of Goths, ravaged Asia, came to Heraclea, and at last to Pontus, where they were beaten [x]. The best account seems to me to be in Zosimus: he calls those Βορανοι, whom Gregory called Βορανδοι. They made an irruption into Pontus, but were driven home by the Roman commander Successianus; yet, as soon as they heard that he was recalled from the province of Pontus, they returned, ravaged Trapezunt, and after having taken as much spoil as they wished [y], again went home of their own accord.

These excursions caused their conversion to Christianity, which, in a short time obtained many proselytes among them: since, at the great Council of Nice, Theophilus, the Gothic Metropolitan at the Bosphorus, subscribed the resolutions [z].

After the Council of Nice, the Goths had a fresh Missionary in Audius, a man of severe habits of life, who, nevertheless, controverted the regulation respecting Easter, and on account of his public refractoriness, was banished from the land by Constantine. He then wandered to Scythia, and still further into the most inward part of Gothland, imparting instruction, and even founding considerable Monastic Establishments, both of men and women [a]. But one

p. 24. 29. Epist. Syn. Greg. Thaum. cum Comm. Balsamon. et Zonar.

[u] Eutrop. Breviar. l. ix. c. 8.

[x] Trebellius Pollio in Galieno, c. 6. 12, 13.

[y] Zosim. l. i. c. 31, 32, 33.

[z] He subscribed the Acta of the Council, according to the Latin Books. Theophilus Gothorum Metropolis and Theophilus Bosphoritanus. Cf. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 41.

[a] Epiphan. Hær. lxx. § 14. p. 827. ed. Colon.

of the Gothic Princes hated the Christian doctrines, and violently persecuted the adopters of them, on the plea that this was the religion of the Roman Emperor: yet he was unable to extirpate the dissemination of the Faith, and the sources of religious knowledge [b].

Such was probably the state of things, when they were compelled to abdicate their land, by the pressure of a wild swarm of greater barbarians than themselves. For the Huns expelled the Eastern Goths: and these, thrown on the Western Goths, pressed on the latter, and drove them before them.

Forced to give way, they had no other means of preservation, than by sending an embassy to Valens, to petition, that they might be received into the Roman lands above the Danube. The Head of this embassy was Ulfila, a Gothic Bishop [c]. To be sure of success, Ulfila promised for himself and Countrymen, to adopt the doctrines of Arius, which were strongly favoured by Valens and those around him [d]. The Emperor granted them their request: and they were soon followed by the other half of the Western Goths, who, like their brethren, were transplanted to Thrace and Mœsia.

But, according to one account, scarcely had they reached their new settlements, than they separated into two parties. Athanarich, who was unfavourable to the doctrines of Christianity, not tolerating them among his people, permitted a violent persecution against those who adopted them. Frithigern, who was devoted to Christianity, conceived himself

[b] Epiphan. loc. cit. § 15. p. 828.
[c] Sozomen. Hist. Eccl. l. vi. c. 37.
[d] Sozomen. l. ii. c. 6. Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. l. iv. c. 37.

bound to defend the persecuted, requested aid from the Emperor, sent Ulfila, and obtained it [d].

This persecution and mission, however, appear to have been referred to a later time merely by mistake, and not to have been one different from that, which we have noticed. Sozomen only knew of this second persecution, and was not aware of the first. The other authors only mention one persecution, at the time that the Goths dwelt in their country, and were orthodox: and to this Epiphanius, from whom we have extracted the preceding account, Socrates, the Historian [f], and Augustin, who assigns it to the days before Arianism [g] transfer it. If, on this account, Ulfila was sent to the Emperor, to implore his assistance against Athanarich the Oppressor, *this* was the first mission of the Gothic Bishop, which rendered the other easy to him, when he came to request a Settlement and Territory for his dispossessed nation.

Valens received the Goths, as we have said. They were admitted to his protection; but, as some time afterwards, Valens was called to a distance by his Eastern affairs, they were in the absence of the Emperor, so grossly mistreated by one of the generals and by the Governor of Thrace, that the aggrieved nation simultaneously arose, broke out into rebellion, and drove their tormentors from the field [h]. From

[d] Sozomen. loc. cit.

[f] Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. iv. c. 33.

[g] Augustin. de Civ. Dei l. xviii. c. 52.—Nisi forte non est persecutio computanda, quando rex Gothorum in ipsâ Gothiâ persecutus est Christianos crudelitate mirabili, cum ibi non essent nisi Catholici, quorum plurimi martyrio coronati sunt: sicut à quibusdam fratribus, qui tunc illic pueri fuerant, et se ista vidisse incunctanter recordabantur, audivimus.

[h] Ammian. Marcellin. l. xxxi. c. 4.

this time they arrayed themselves in Roman arms, which they had taken from the besieged, and were doubly formidable.

Valens upon this hastened from Asia to punish them. Although they were in a condition to meet him on the field of battle, they nevertheless sent an Embassy to him to excuse themselves and appease him. The Historian gives to him, who had this commission, the title of CHRISTIANI RITUS PRESBYTER; probably, we may here find for the third time Ulfila, in the capacity of an Embassador. But, now the fate of Valens was decreed, (so the Historian proceeds:) it came to a battle, and the Emperor was left on the field of slaughter [i]. From this period, the Goths became more firmly established in their possessions, and had they known the value of their victory, they would not have allowed themselves to have been sent away from the Gates of Constantinople with presents.

SECTION CXXXVI.

THE Bishop of the Goths, whom the ancients at one time call Ulfilas, at another Wulfilas, who is sufficiently known to us from his deeds, is unanimously celebrated in history, as the Inventor of the Gothic characters, and as the Translator of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament [k]. However generally

[i] Ammian. Marcellinus, l. xxxi. c. 12.

[k] Socrates Hist. Eccl. L. iv. c. 27. in some editions. 33. Sozomen. L. vi. c. 37. Cassiodor. Hist. tripartit. L. viii. c. 13. Jornandes de reb. Goth. c. 51. Heupelii Dissert. de Ulfilâ, Witteberg, 1693. Essbergii Ulphilas Gothor. Episc. Holmiæ. 1700. both in Büsching's Collection. Benzelii Præfat. before the Gothic Gospels, edited by Edward Lye.

the ancients expressed themselves, as far as it relates to his merit respecting all the Scriptures, τας θειας γραφας, ιερας βιβλους, *Divinas Scripturas*, Philostorgius alone averred, that the Books of the Kings should be excepted, because Ulfila accounted it unadvisable to give a warlike history to his belligerent nation, which might inflame the fever of their imaginations [l]. Were the historical fidelity of Philostorgius less assailed than it is, it might still be rejoined against him, that for the same reason Ulfila would not have dared to translate Joshua, Judges, and even a great part of Moses and other Books.

Before we pass to the question, when Ulfila undertook the translation, we must correct an error, which misrepresents the history of his life. The same Philostorgius depicts this Bishop as an extraordinary man in the time of Constantine the Great, and introduces him at the Council of Nice [m]. For he has mistaken Constantinus for Constantius, and the Nicene Council for the Constantinopolitan, which under the superintendence of Acacius passed its decisions as to Doctrine, in a manner by no means agreeable to the Orthodox, in which, however, Ulfila remained true to the Doctrines of the Fathers. I quote the words of Sozomen on this subject: επι δε της Κωνσταντιου βασιλειας απεριεσκεπτως οιμαι τοις αμφι Ευδοξιον και Ακακιον της εν Κωνσταντινοπολει Συνοδω διεμεινε κοινωνων τοις ιερευσι των εν Νικαια συνελθοντων. l. vi. c. 37.

Although he might at an earlier period have entered on public affairs, yet was it at a later period that he translated the Scriptures, when with his Goths he occupied the new settlement, on this side

[l] Philostorg. Hist. Eccl. L. ii. c. 5.
[m] Philostorg. loc. cit.

of the Danube. This is attested by the historian Socrates[n]; and the language and written characters of the Translation afford manifest proofs of this assertion. A part of the letters, of which he has formed the Gothic alphabet, is borrowed from the Roman, such as *d. h. s.* and *f.* The many Latin expressions, which he has adopted in his version (§ 132) præ-suppose a Settlement of his countrymen in the Roman Provinces, during which they became acquainted with the meaning of these terms.

SECTION CXXXVII.

The version itself is derived from the Greek text. The orthography observable in it is borrowed from the Greeks: the I is for the most part expressed by EI: SΧΚϚIS, *thou seekest,* oftener occurs as SΧΚϚEIS. — SΧΚIΦ, *he seeks,* is more frequently written SΧΚEIΦ. As the Greeks pronounced γ before γ or before κ as *ν.*, so the same custom was established in the Orthography of the Gothic Version; in the examples I will retain[o] the Greek Γ as it is in the Codex: ΪNNΓΛΓΓΛIΦ ΦΛIKH ΛΓΓϒN ΔΛNK. ΠNTE ΒΚΛIΔ ΔΛNK ϚΛH ΚΠMS ϒIΓS SΛ ΒΚIΓΓΛNΔΛ ΪN ÞΚΛΛNSTΛI. "Pass ye through the narrow gate; for broad is the gate and roomy (is) the way, which leads to destruction," Matt. vii. 3. This single verse affords to us three examples. In addition to it we can adduce Matt. vi. 31. ΔΚIΓΚΛM, *to drink;* xi. 42.— ΓΛΔΚΛΓΚEIΦ, *he gives to drink;* Mark ii. 16.

[n] Socrat. L. iv. c. 33.

[o] Hug, from his inability to procure Gothic characters, was obliged to introduce the Greek Γ in his examples printed in Roman letters. TRANSLATOR.

ΔRIITTKIΦ. *he drinketh*: and from the fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, xii. 20. ΔRΛIΓKEI, *give him to drink*; xiv. 15. ΓΛITTIS *thou goest*.

This is still further evident from the care, which the Translator has taken in giving to particular words their etymological force. In Mark xii. 33. he renders ὁλοκαυτωμάτα precisely according to the etymology, ΛΛΛBKIIINSTE; John vii. 3. σκηνοπηγια—hΛEΦ-RΛSTΛKEINS, *the fixing of tents*; John x. 22. ἐγκαινια—ĪNNIIIĢIΦΛ, compounded of *in* and *jung*, as the other of ἐν and καινος. Where all the Latins (*Vercellens. Veronens. Brixiens. Corb.*) in Luke i. 52. translate ὑπερηφανους, *superbos*, he renders it MIKIΛΦIIhTΛNS for the sake of representing the ὑπερ and φαινομαι. In Luke i. 1. where the Latin versions have very incorrectly expressed πεπληροφορημενων by *completæ sunt*, he accurately discovers the sense and composition—ΓΛ:IIΛΛΛVEISIΔRNS. Or in Mark xiv. 56. where the Latin Translator required two words at least for ἐψευδομαρτυρουν, he felicitously comprises the composition in one word, ΓΛΛIIIΓ-VERTVRΔIΔEΔIIN; immediately afterwards also, where the Latin Translator was forced to place *non manufactum* for ἀχειροποιητον, he confines himself, like the Greek, to one expression IINhΛNΔIIVΛII-RhTΛ.

The Translator has also mistaken one word for another, which mistake could only have arisen from the Greek text having been before him. Thus in Luke iii. 14. he mistook ΑΡΧΕΣΘΕ for ΑΡΚΕΙΣΘΕ: but the word VΛΛΔΛN exists in the Franconian and Anglo-Saxon dialects in the sense, in which we still adopt it, and in composition is found the same in the Gothic also, Mark x. 42. ΓΛVΛΛΔΛNΔ *go-*

Had Lye and Ihre referred at this word to

the corresponding Greek term, and then compared that which Luke used, these two diligent scholars would not have been at a loss in this place. Here even the Gothic readers might have desired to explain their version, probably from Latin MSS. For the words ΓΛΝϧIdΛI SIϤПΨ are added on the margin, as if they had had before them *contenti estote*, (Veronens. Brix.) or *sufficientes estote*, (Vercellens.)

The mistake of the word πεπωρωκεν for πεπληρωκεν is of the same nature in Joh. xvi. 6. where ΓΛdΛП-ЬIdΛ, *distracts*, is translated for ΓΛ⊧ПΛΛIdΛ, *fills*: this mistake has been remarked before, as well as that in Luke vii. 26., where for τρυφη, the word τροφη, ⊧ПdЄINS, *food* or *nourishment*, is written.

In John vii. 12. ἀληθης is substituted for ἀγαθος, which is very easy in Greek: yet, in the Cod. Brix. Argent, which is very nearly allied to this, the same substitution occurs: it also reads *verax est*. It will therefore be difficult to determine, which of the two originally committed the blunder, or borrowed it from the other.

There is a similar instance in Matt. viii. 9. where the Translator having incorrectly made the stops, joined ἐχων to ἐξουσιαν, and then either for the sake of preserving the sense or by mistake changed ὑπ' ἐμαυτον into την ἐμαυτου. In this way then he read the passage: ἐγω ἀνθρωπος εἰμι ὑπο ἐξουσιαν ἐχων την ἐμαυτου στρατιωτας. A thing of this sort could only arise from the immediate view of the Greek text. But, the Cod. Brixiens, accurately exhibits this turn of the passage, *et ego homo sum habens sub potestatem meam milites*. Who may now decide, which of the two Translators first misinterpreted the original text? and which was indebted to the other for his interpretation?

I conceive also, that there is a change of words

in another place: although the instance be not analogous to the preceding, yet I will indulge myself in a few words on it, as an opportunity is afforded to me, of drawing attention to an emendation in the Gothic text. In Matt. xxvii. 48. δραμων is strangely translated *bearing;* but as φερων and δραμων could not well be mistaken for one another, the error must lie elsewhere, viz. in the Gothic. Here, the mistake lies between the words SΠNSΦKΛΓΙdΛ and SΠNSΠKΛΓΓIdΛ, *he bore quickly,—he ran quickly.*

But in Luke i. 10. προσδεχομενον ƁƐIdΛNdΛNS, which is still retained in the Suabian *beithen*, is substituted for προσευχομενον. In Luke xvi. 14. αὐτοι οὐκ ἐχουσιν is read for ὁτι οὐκ ἐχουσιν, in Luke xv. 16. κερατων hΛΠKNƐ for κερατιων:—for in Luke i. 69. κερας has also been translated, hΛΠKN; and thus in Matt. ix. 23. hΛΠKNIΛNdΛNS, *horn-blowers* occurs. In Luke xix. 23. μνας was taken for an abbreviation, resolved into μεριδας, and translated ΔΛIΛϚS *Parts.* In Romans xi. 33. instead of ἀνεξερευνητα, the Translator reads ἀνεξιρετα, which is a compound hardly to be found in a good author; nevertheless he has repeated it syllable for syllable, NΠ-ΠS-SIIIΛΛϚdΛ; —not ἀῤῥητα.

Lastly, in Luke ix. 18. συνησαν αὐτῳ is interpreted ΓΛMϚTIdƐdΠN ïMMΛ, which Edward Lye explains by the Swedish *motte hom*, and the English *met him.* There is also no doubt, that ΓΛMϚTϚΛN (Luke xiv. 31.; Mark xiv. 13.) means *to meet.* Thus συνηντησαν would have been here mistaken for συνησαν.

SECTION CXXXVIII.

THERE must have been, therefore, a Greek Book, from which the Translator executed his task, and as we have seen, it must have been a copy of the Constantinopolitan recension. We will exhibit examples from the eleventh chapter of Mark.

	LUCIAN.		HESYCHIUS.	
2.	οὐδεις ἀνθρωπων		οὐδεις οὐπω ἀνθρωπων	
	λυσαντες αὐτον ἀγαγετε	G.	λυσατε αὐτον και φερετε	
3.	αὐτον ἀποστελλει ὠδε	G.	ἀποστελλει παλιν αὐτον	
6.	ἐνετειλατο	G.	εἰπεν	
7.	ἐνεβαλων	G.	ἐπιβαλλουσιν	
	ἐπ' αὐτῳ		ἐπ' αὐτον	
9.	ἐκραζον λεγοντες	G.	ἐκραζον	
10.	βασιλεια ἐν ὀνοματι Κυριου	G.	βασιλεια	
11.	εἰς Ἱεροσυλυμα ὁ Ἰησους	G.	εἰς Ἱεροσολυμα	
13.	μακροθεν	G.	ἀπο μακροθεν	
	εὑρησει τι	G.	τι εὑρησει	
14.	ἐκ σου εἰς τον αἰωνα	G.	εἰς τον αἰωνα ἐκ σου	
15.	εἰσελθων ὁ Ἰησους	G.	εἰσελθων	
18.	γραμματεις και οἱ ἀρχιερεις	G.	ἀρχιερεις και οἱ γραμματεις	
23.	αὐτῳ ὁ ἐαν εἰπῃ	G.	αὐτῳ	
24.	λαμβανετε	G.	ἐλαβετε	
26.	*)			
28.	και λεγουσιν		και ἐλεγον	G.
	την ἐξουσ. ταυτ. ἐδωκ.	G.	ἐδωκ. την ἐξουσ. ταυτ.	
29.	ἀποκριθεις εἰπεν	G.	εἰπεν	
32.	ὁτι ὀντως προφητης	G.	ὀντως ὁτι προφητης	
33.	λεγουσι τῳ Ἰησου		τῳ Ἰησου λεγουσιν.	

In this chapter he has two peculiar readings, in which no one besides agrees with the Gothic text: at ver. 10., after ἐν ὀνοματι he omits Κυριου, probably because the following του πατρος ἡμων Δαβιδ did not ap-

pear to him compatible with Κυριου. At ver. 33., also, instead of λεγ. τῳ̄ Ἰησου he reads λεγ. αὐτῳ.

The twenty-sixth verse, which is wanting in several Ægyptian documents, and probably in this Recension in general, which I cannot, however, entirely trust myself to assert, exists in all the Constantinopolitan MSS. as well as in the Gothic text.

In two readings, he however follows neither Lucian's nor Hesychius's Recension, but confines himself to the third. At the very beginning of the chapter, he read, οὐδεις πωποτε ἀνθρωπων not οὐπω, as Lye says: for πω or πωποτε is ⲛⲗⲛⲏ, but οὐδεπω or οὐπω is ⲛⲓⲛⲛⲗⲛⲏ. He has this first reading in common with the Codex Argenteus. At ver. 8. where the Constantinopolitan and Ægyptian Recensions agree in the words εἰς την ὁδον, he translates them not ⲓⲛ ⲫⲓⲧ but ἐν τῃ ὁδῳ, ⲗⲛⲗ ⲫⲓⲧⲗ, as we find it in A. K. M. 11. 114. 116. But in other readings he again so differs from the MSS. of the third Recension, that these two instances determine nothing relative to the whole.

It was not however fated, that this document should long remain without additions: the Latin versions before Jerome, with which the Goths in Italy were acquainted, afforded (as it is supposed) different materials for decorating this venerable book with several additions.

This could not fail to have taken place, as frequently one of the Latin versions was written at the side of the Text, of which the Fragments of the Epistle to the Romans are an evident proof. It was now often attempted to harmonize them, where they disagreed: probably, frequently, merely from a calligraphical design, that the number of the lines and verses might mutually agree.

Where they were not written by the side of each

other, the collation of them gave rise to marginal observations, which were afterwards inserted into the Text. Ihre enumerates fourteen marginal notes from the Codex Argenteus, in the preface to his Ulfilas illustratus, which were ready in the next copy, which might be taken of them, to occupy their place in the Text, as emendations, *e. g.* Luke ix. 34. ἐν τῳ ἐκεινους εἰσελθειν εἰς την νεφελην, where the Translator having accurately confined himself to the Greek words, some one has placed the Latin reading on the side, ϚΛh ΛTÏMÏN MIΛhMIN ΛTΓΛΓΓΛNdΛM like the Codex Veronens. and Brixiens. *et intrantibus illis in nubem.* Junius even adopted the latter reading into the Text in his edition.

Hence came such heterogeneous parts in a version, which is designed to represent the Constantinopolitan Recension with an uncommon accuracy, and to translate word for word. For instance, the great addition in Luke ix. 43. after πασιν οἰς ἐποιει, which also appears in the MS. at Brescia, comes from the Latin: *dixit Petrus: Domine, quare nos non potuimus ejicere eum? at ille dixit, hoc genus non exiet, nisi in orationibus et jejuniis;* so shortly afterwards at v. 50. after ὑπερ ὑμων ἐστιν—where the Latin MSS. read, *nemo est enim, qui non faciat virtutem in nomine meo, et poterit malè loqui de me,* the first part as far as *et poterit* is also seen in the Gothic text with a slight alteration: *nec ullus enim est hominum, qui non,* &c. But it is too notorious (indeed it has throughout been an injury to this version) that its readers were acquainted with the older text of the Latins, for us to impose on ourselves the trouble of bringing together further examples and proofs.

Yet, the difficulty, which thence arises in criticism, is not great. The duty, which may hence be required from the Gothic version, from its origin and descent, is, that it give testimony, as to that,

which was formerly genuine, and recognized in the Constantinopolitan Recension. In this office, it fully appears as an ancient and credible witness; but, that its depositions may be rendered pure and authentic, it will be necessary, accurately to separate and disjoin that, which has been added to it from the Latin. This is for the most part so recognizable, and is so easy of detection by means of a collation, that we can rarely be in danger of error.

As to what relates to the Epistles, the passages produced as a specimen by Mai are not entirely qualified to develop the Recension which the version expresses; because many of the variations, in which the Recensions differ from each other, are not discoverable in the Versions, and this is far more the case in the edited specimens, than in the other chapters of Paul's Epistles.

SECTION CXXXIX.

The conduct of this Translator displays a *capable* man of sound judgment and activity, who *does not* comprise the meaning of the text, merely in *general* terms, nor has recourse to a paraphrastic version without reference to each of the individual words or smaller parts of speech: but who closely adheres to his Text, and knows how to adapt his language to it by well-chosen expressions and happy compounds, without forcing it, or adapting to it an ill-understood literal translation. We see, that he sometimes hesitates respecting the Greek, yet is he a perfect master of his own tongue. It was, in fact, no small thing to undertake such a work in a Dialect, the laws of which were not investigated, nor systematically decided and ar[illegible]d by any inquirer, and yet to execute it with

such consistency and uniformity in the arrangement of the language, as if he had been provided with a regular grammar.

He himself appears to have added the stops, for the sake of assisting the reading and comprehension of his countrymen; for, they appear in general both in the Upsal and Ambrosian copies, in the same manner; a stop being placed at the end of each passage, and two at the close of a string of passages or a section.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is wanting in both the Milan MSS. and not from mere accident, as I am positively assured; yet it need not surprise us, since the advocates of Arianism in general did not recognize it. Compare the second volume of this Introduction, Section cxl. p. 508.

THE SCLAVONIC VERSION [o].

SECTION CXL.

In the Beginning of the ninth Century, the Archbishops of Lorch, in the present Austria on the Ens, attempted to circulate and establish Christianity in Moravia. Their attempt succeeded; many Principal men of the kingdom, among whom was the Duke Moymir joined the Preachers of the Faith and were baptized.

But, the misunderstanding between Ludwig (Louis)

[o] Hug is very defective in his account of the Sclavonic versions: whether it be from ignorance of the dialects, or from other causes, he has omitted many very important particulars, for which the reader is referred to Henderson's Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia, &c. London, 1826. TRANSLATOR.

King of Germany, and Rastislaw, Duke of Moravia, shut out the German preachers from this country. When Rastislaw heard the success with which Constantine, surnamed the Philosopher, announced Christianity to the Kazars, on the northern shore of the Black Sea, he resolved for ever to free himself from the German preachers, and requested from the Court of Constantinople this Constantine, who was afterwards called Cyril, as the instructor of his Dominions. He appeared accompanied by his brother Methodius, and entered on his new vocation. Hitherto Latin Books were used at Divine worship in Moravia. Constantine and his Brother quickly perceived how much influence they must gain over the nation, if they could prepare the public services of Religion in the language of the country. They, therefore, delivered to them the alphabet, which they had designed for the Bulgarians, and a Sclavonian version of the Psalter, of the New Testament, and the Liturgical books. The success justified their undertaking, but it was disapproved at Rome. Yet, they were not bigotted against their more rational ideas, but sought only a middle way.

SECTION CXLI.

Thus, the Sclavonic version in the middle of the ninth Century, as we have already seen, was prepared by two Native Greeks from Greek MSS. They were born, educated, and instructed, under the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, and were sent also from Constantinople into this new harvest. We may thence conclude of what description the MSS. were, which they brought with them, and what text the version would follow.

With respect to the whole it certainly exhibits the text of that family of MSS. which we have called the Constantinopolitan or Lucian's recension. We will adduce in proof only one chapter of the Gospels. All the readings here extracted from Lucian's recension are expressed in the Sclavonic version, as far as we are acquainted with it from Prof. Alter's collation of two MSS. in the Royal Library at Vienna, viz. Cod. Slav. N. cccIvi. and N. cccIv.

MARK V.

LUCIAN.	HESYCHIUS.
2. και ἐξελθοντι αὐτῳ	και ἐξελθοντος αὐτου
3. ἁλυσεσιν οὐδεις	ἁλυσει οὐκετι οὐδεις
9. σοι ὀνομα	ὀνομα σοι
ἀπεκριθη λεγων	λεγει αὐτῳ
12. και παρεκαλεσαν αὐτον παντες οἱ δαιμονες λεγ.	και παρεκαλεσαν αὐτον λεγ.
13. αὐτοις εὐθεως ὁ Ἰησους και ἐξελθ.	αὐτοις και ἐξελθ.
14. οἱ δε βοσκ.... τους χοιρους και ἐξηλθον	και οἱ βοσκ. αὐτους και ηλθον
15. καθημ....και ἱματισ..	καθημ....ἱματισ.
18. ἱνα ᾖ μετ' αὐτου	ἱνα μετ' αὐτου ᾖ
19. ὁ δε Ἰησους οὐκ ἀφηκ.	και οὐκ ἀφηκ.
22. και ἰδου ἐρχ..	και ἐρχ.
23. και ζησεται	και ζησῃ.
25. και γυνη τις	και γυνη
33. γεγονεν ἐπ' αὐτῃ	γεγονεν αὐτῃ
38. και ἐρχεται	και ἐρχονται
40. ὁ δε ἐκβαλ.... το παιδιον ἀνακειμενον	αὐτος δε ἐκβαλ, το παιδιον.

One of the principal Scholars and Friends of Sclavonic literature appears to have formed his judgment less in reference to the whole, and to the tone, which this version generally asserts, than to some particular readings which had been engraved

when he would assure us, that the version principally agrees with Codex L and D [p].

It certainly has those readings also; for, it has happened, that the MSS. of one recension have been interpolated from the others, although, I apprehend, that but a very small part of these is derived from interpolations of Greek MSS. It at least occurs very often, that these inserted readings, which it has in common with L. and D., are also found in the Vulgate and the Latin Fathers. For example, Matt. x. 12. την οικιαν λεγοντες, ειρηνη εν τω οικω τουτω. DL. Vulg. xii. 15. παντας δε, ως εθεραπευσεν, επεληξεν. D. Slav. 2 Vulg. xvii. 2. λευκα ως το χιον, D. Slav. Vulg. Mark xi. 15. και παλιν ερχονται. L. Vul. xi. 24. οτι ληψεσθε. D. Vulg. xiv. 41. αναπανεσθε το τελος. D. Latt. xv. 16. εσω εις την αυλην. D. Latt. Luke ii. 33. ὁ πατηρ αυτου και ἡ μητηρ αυτου. BDL. Slav. i. Vulg. xi. 14. δαιμονιου εκβληθεντος. AL. Vulg. &c.

SECTION CXLII.

THE interpolation from the Latin is possible and conceivable, if the arrangement of John the VIIIth respecting the Ecclesiastical use of the Sclavonic tongue was ever put into execution [q]. Yet I will not deny, that the singularities may be explained from the condition of the copy, whence the version was made.

[p] Doborowsky in Michaëlis's New Oriental and Exegetical Library, Par. vii. p. 155—167.

[q] Baron. ad ann. 880. Jubemus tamen (thus John VIIIth writes to Duke Swatopluk) ut in omnibus Ecclesiis Terræ vestræ propter majorem honorificentiam Evangelium Latinè legatur, ut postmodum Slavonicâ Linguâ translatum in auribus populi verba non intelligentis annuncietur, sicut in quibusdam Ecclesiis fieri videtur. Num. xix.

One recension was sometimes interpolated from the others, and thus in Constantine's copy readings from the κοινη ἐκδοσις and the Egyptian books might have been discovered [r].

SECTION CXLIII.

ALTHOUGH this version may not lay claim to a very high age, yet it is a precious Document, well worthy of critical labour. The chief Edition of the Gospels is said to be the Quarto Edition, which appeared in Wallachia, in the year 1512; then the Gospels, which appeared at Vilna, 1575; the Bible at Ostrog, 1581; and a reimpression at Moscow, 1663.

[r] I willingly yield this homage to Dobrowsky, who in SLAVANCA (a periodical work on Sclavonic Literature, 2d Ed. Prague, 1815.) defended the Sclavonic version from the charge of Interpolation from the Latin, which in the first edition of this work I more confidently asserted than I ought.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM.

SECTION CXLIV.

THE cause of those occurrences, which have had an influence on the text of the New Testament, has been unfolded to us:—the means, which afford to us their aid in detecting the errors which have found their way into it, have already been enumerated and criticized in their order. It will now be our principal object to enquire into the principles, by which we have been guided in this task. These will we as accurately as possible deduce from the various fates, to which the text was exposed, and from observing how the different errors were introduced into it; for, in this, as in most instances, where it depends upon practical rules and the mode of applying them, History is the instructress, who yields to us information.

The more the History of the text has been developed, the more simplicity and certainty has criticism gained in the discharge of its office. We now know that in its decisions every thing depends merely on a few voices, which must be compared, examined, and scrutinized. It has ceased to be an everlasting labour, to which no boundary is perceived, in which there is no end of seeking various readings, in which in each particular instance reference to some hundred documents is necessary, in which each has to speak for itself; in which each being undecided, which to follow among the many,

made his choice according to his own judgment, from predilection for some one MS., from a liking to some one peculiarity, to some new various reading, which appeared in a particular Codex, and from other reasons by no means better,—and framed a text, which the next editor rejected, that he might see the same right exercised on himself also by his successor. We now know the hiatus, which are in our critical apparatus; we perceive a boundary to our labours, an object in compiling, a law by which we may decide.

Our Documents are now divided into certain classes, under which each individual must be comprized, which we already possess and sufficiently know, or which we yet shall obtain, unless indeed an additional new class makes its appearance. That which cannot be comprized under one of these classes, that which has sprung up from several jumbled together at hap-hazard, and from strange admixtures, can only so far come into consideration, as it is calculated to illustrate the History of all the occurrences, to which the text was exposed. We have a text of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, which, in regard to the Gospels, is expressed in the Codex D, the MSS. of Thomas of Charkel, and in 1. 13. 69. 124; in regard to the Acts of the Apostles, in DE and the MSS. of Thomas; in regard to the Epistles in DEFG, and in general in the old Syriac, in the Latin versions before Jerome, and in the Upper-Ægyptian, or Thebaïc.

We have a corrected text by Hesychius, which in the Gospels, BCL and some others preserve—in the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles, ABC. 40. Vat. 367. M'. 1.:—in Paul's Epistles, ABC. 17. 46.—in the Apocalypse AC. Vat. 579, and 26. Vindob. Kollar. The whole, however, is preserved in the

Lower-Ægyptian or Memphitic version—and Paul's and the Catholic Epistles are preserved in the Æthiopic.

We have a corrected text of the Gospels by Lucian in the MSS. EFGHSV. and *b. h.*:—we have also that of the Acts of the Apostles in the Moscow MSS. *f. a*1. *b. d. c. m. k.* in the *Alex. Vat.* 29. and *Lambec.* xxxviii. xxxv. We have Paul's and the Catholic Epistles in the Moscow Codex *g.* and in *k. l. m. c. d. a*3. *b.* in *Alex. Vat.* 29. *Pio. Vat.* 50. and *Lambec.* xxviii. xxxvii. xxxv. 1. We have the Apocalypse in *r. k. p. l.* and *o. Harleian.* 5613, or *Griesb.* 29., *Lamb.* 1., *Alex. Vat.* 68., *Vat.* 116., *Pio-Vat.* 50. We have the Gospels in the Gothic version, the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles in the Arabic version of the Polyglott, and the whole in the Sclavonic version.

Lastly, we have also a revised text by Origen, in A. K. M. 42. 114. 116. M^{t}. 10. and in the Philoxenian version. The MSS. in which the remaining parts of the New Testament are contained, a more accurate acquaintance with this version will disclose.

SECTION CXLV.

THE κοινη ἐκδοσις, as we have shown, exhibits the most ancient text, but with many alterations, which it suffered throughout the second and a part of the third Century. These alterations were private attempts to elucidate the Bible, and as such were not inserted in all MSS., but were different, according to readers, places, countries, and times. Thus those passages in which these alterations are found, are arbitrary distortions of the common text. To have the true text, we must be in possession of the most

ancient, on which no such attempts have been made. On this point we are agreed, and consequently assume it as a principle, that,

THAT TEXT IS THE TRUE ONE, WHICH WAS UNIFORMLY READ IN THE MOST ANCIENT TIMES IN EVERY MANUSCRIPT.

To discover this, however, we must be provided with a very great number of Documents of the κοινη ἐκδοσις of different countries and dates, that we may be able to decide by means of the collation, what has been added to the text merely in particular times and places. But this is now impossible: and if this principle be valid, we may evidently doubt, whether we shall ever again recover the oldest uniform text. So it appears: yet each of the Recensions can only avail to the purpose, because their Authors collected a very great number of the MSS. in their country, for the sake of adopting or rejecting readings, according to their uniformity or disparity. Therefore each Recension comprizes a collection of MSS. of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, as far as in one country, they were uniform in a particular text, and we thus have a second principle:

THE BOOKS OF THE KOINH EKΔOΣIΣ AND THE RECENSIONS OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES CONJOINTLY AFFORD TO US THE MEANS OF RECOGNIZING THE MOST ANCIENT AND UNIFORM TEXT.

SECTION CXLVI.

Not one of the Recensions, however, has reached us in its MSS. in an uncorrupted state: each of them has been exposed to manifold contingencies, in the course of time. Hence, our first consideration must

be to ascertain, what each of them did or did not read; what it asserts and testifies for itself; we must in the first place restore the recensions to their purity. Hence arises again the ancient principle, viz.

THAT, WHICH CONJOINTLY THE DOCUMENTS OF A RECENSION UNIFORMLY EXHIBIT, IS THE PECULIAR READING OF THE RECENSION.

a.—But, where MSS. disagree, the older must be preferred to the more modern: since they have not so often passed through the hands of copyists, who have inserted into the text the *studia* and remarks, which were on the margin and between the lines, and indulged themselves also in their own speculations.

b.—More modern MSS. are to be preferred to others of their date, or come next in rank to the first, if they do not degenerate into many peculiarities, if they contain but few *lectiones singulares*, if they have received but few additions or suffered few corrections, and betray no negligence; in proportion as they in general are more in unison with their family altogether.

c.—Where we have both, the older MS. and the more modern copy, they are to be considered but as one Document, and are not to avail as two Witnesses.

d.—The older the versions are, of which we have good critical editions, the more they approach to the time, when the recensions, which they express, proceeded from the hand of the Emendator, and are therefore more decisive than a MS. In most instances, however, the Translator made use of more than one MS. of the Country.

e.—This also applies to the earlier Fathers, provided we be assured of that which they read.

These ancient and long acknowledged rules, even in

cases, where they would be insufficient and inadequate, were maintained and supported by internal arguments. The critics, to whom we are indebted for the Recensions, gave the preference in the choice of readings to the best grammatical style, or the purest Greek phraseology, particularly to that of Hesychius. (§ 37.) In consequence of this their critical procedure, it follows, that—

a.—That is the genuine reading of the Recension, which approaches the nearest to the laws of the Greek tongue, or is the more elegant.

b.—That the Recensions arose from the κοινη ἐκδοσις of their country. Whichever reading agrees the most with this, is, where MSS. vary, the most probable.

c.—But that here another historical observation must be proposed. In later times, even the revised copies from the Books of the κοινη ἐκδοσις were again interpolated. (§ 40.) If now there be any trace, that the agreement proceeded from this cause, if, for example, the reading of the κοινη ἐκδοσις only appears in more modern MSS., and be only written in others, now on the margin, now between the lines, or be placed by means of a correction over the earlier reading, if such signs of a later obliteration be discovered, then precisely the contrary principle from the preceding is valid.

d.—That the reading of a Recension, which agrees the least with another Recension, is the preferable. For the Recensions were in latter times frequently interpolated from one another by Transcribers and Readers, who collated different books. (§ 37.)

e.—That it will also be easy to remark, where MSS. disagree, whether the beginning or end of the Church-reading, the critical observations of the Fathers or Commentators had an influence on their

difference, in which case then the suspected part must yield to that, to which no such a suspicion is attached.

f.—And it has appeared from my observations, that Hesychius generally favoured the shorter reading, and Lucian the longer. § 38. 110. 138. 142.

SECTION CXLVII.

When we are certain what is the reading of each Recension, it then becomes the office of the critic to collate these three Recensions, and the existing books of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, where they differ.

Each Recension is in fact a collection of several MSS. of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, with this difference, that the judgment of the author of the Recension has indeed rejected or added what appeared to him worthy of rejection or adoption from the collation of the MSS. —yet more frequently, as it suited his taste and peculiar ideas. This last practice chiefly originated in the preference given to the pure and more elegant reading, as far as it related to Greek idiom, and more particularly in the care of avoiding in every possible instance all Hebrew turns and phrases.

I. When therefore the yet existing books of the κοινη ἐκδοσις agree in a harsh and barbarous phrase, their agreement avails more than that of the Recensions in one more grammatically correct and polished.

II. Since not only the Recensors but also the Readers of the κοινη ἐκδοσις actively laboured to destroy the Hebraisms, where a Hebraism is still con-

tained in a Book of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, it is therefore to be considered as a genuine part of the text preserved in opposition to the voice of the Recensions.

III. It is also a generally admitted principle, to decide in favor of that reading, which is surrounded with exegetical difficulties: because every corrector endeavoured to elucidate or remove such, and because corrections were never applied to render passages more difficult, although they were applied to render them more intelligible. But the Books of the κοινη ἐκδοσις must so agree respecting such a reading, that we are not to apprehend the difficulty to have originally arisen from the awkwardness and error of the Librarii.

These are the instances, in which the voice of the κοινη ἐκδοσις outweighs the authority of all the Recensions, whose authors in these did not so much follow the assertions of the best copies, which they quoted, as their own private judgment.

SECTION CXLVIII.

IV. But in general the Recensions maintain a far higher authority, than the existing Documents of the κοινη ἐκδοσις. For each of them has proceeded from the collation of several of these Documents, and is the sum of several copies of the κοινη ἐκδοσις. Where, therefore, they agree, *there* is a general reading authenticated in different countries and copies.

V. But, if the recensions are divided into different voices, it will indeed be difficult to know how to give the preference to one above the other. For,

we can ascertain from none of them, that its composer carefully quoted more, older, and better copies than the other. If we would grant a precedence to one of them, it could only be to that of Origen, since its author was for the longest period enveloped in critical employments, was able to collect more MSS. than the others, and conducted himself more cautiously and prudently than any of the ancient critics. Yet even such a preference is rarely practically available; for, in that case, two Recensions would speak against one.

VI. Where this takes place, the majority of voices decides. For, as each of the Recensors consulted several MSS. in his Province to prepare the text, so is the agreement of several Recensions, of two against one, so much the more valid, since the MSS. of two different Provinces could not easily have likewise fallen into the same corruptions, in the greater number of those MSS. from which these critics made their decision.

VII. But all three Recensions are divided respecting dissimilar readings written on some one particular passage. The origin of this difference is either to be retraced to the Authors, who preferred the more grammatical, the less Hebraic, and more elegant reading (thus the principles cited in the preceding section are manifest), or its origin lies in the ancient copies which they followed, in which particular errors were so generally extended, that critics were tempted to adopt them, as the genuine reading.

a.—But the old copies, not to speak of that which was inserted into them from Harmonies and Apocrypha, were so corrupted, that passages and ex-

pressions past from one writer to the other, or from one parallel place to the other, that even an expression, sentence, &c. was transferred from the Old Testament, where mention was made of it in the New. § 24. n. 3. § 31. n. 3.

b.—That the beginning and end of the Church-lessons were even introduced into the Text. § 24. n. 6. § 31. n. 6.

c.—That a change took place in the position of the words, for the sake of more closely uniting the subject with these initiatory and final forms, or for the sake of uniting passages in general, which were too much separated, or seemed remote from each other. § 33. n. 6.

d.—That some passages were also periphrastically given. § 33. n. 4.

Where there is such a radical error in a Recension, or any like to it, of which we have enumerated many in the History of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, its voice is no further to be considered or respected in deciding upon true readings.

VIII. Yet may it happen, when the three Recensions deviate into different readings on one passage, that two of them are more alike, and only differ in inconsequential points, in which case, their agreement in the principal point brings us nearer to the true reading.

IX. But it might happen, where the Recensions disagree, that the Documents of the κοινη ἐκδοσις may concur with one of them, and give to it a preponderance over the others. Or, the unrevised text might offer to us data, from whence we could judge, how the readings of the Recensions arose, so that we

might derive information from their origin, as to the credit which they deserve.

X. These rules have relation to additions or transformations in the text; but we have not yet considered an additional sort of variations, viz. the omissions. In these there is one generally received rule, viz. that where one sentence ends in the same manner as the following with the same expressions, or a like phrase, that which is defective be again introduced into the text, since it has only been lost on account of the Homoioteleuton.

XI. But, omissions intentionally occur, when synonyms followed each other in such a way, that one of them was accounted an addition by the critic, or rejected as such. § 24. n. 7.

XII. Or, which is nearly the same thing, when tautologous phrases or sentences, which are not uncommon with the Hebrews, occur, one of them was removed from the text, as an exegetical addition. § 24. n. 8.

If, where the recensions differ, one of these causes has occasioned the destruction of any one expression or passage in a Recension, such an omission is to be restored from the others.

SECTION CXLIX.

But in the use and appreciation of these critical expedients, we must be principally guided by an accurate study of the author, so as to represent his style,

his favorite expressions and phrases, his customary use of conjunctions, and his grammatical peculiarities, &c. Nor until we are intimate with the character of each in this respect, can we decide, which readings belong to him, which we should select and which we should reject.

One is inclined here to confess a critical feeling. I grant, that it often felicitously guides us in works of art and taste, without always being explained in intelligible ideas. But, as long as we stop here, our Κρισις is merely guess-work: this is only sufficient as a transient glance for the artist, until he has received the full impression: then he analyses his perceptions, seeks their foundation in the object, and satisfies himself, that he has correctly perceived it, and whence he thus perceived it. Still more must this be the case, in writings which are rather Anomalies than works of art [5].

[5] For the Servian, Georgian and other versions, omitted by Hug, the reader is referred to Henderson's Bib. Res. and Travels in Russia, 1826.—Translator.

END OF VOL. I.



LONDON:

PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,

ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

